

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A  
A  
0  
0  
0  
7  
9  
3  
5  
6  
5  
3











# At the Edge of the Pit

BY

MILES DOBSON, C. E.

AUTHOR OF

“CAUCA, THE EDEN OF THE ANDES”

“THE RECRUDESCENCE OF THE PANAMA FAILURE”  
(1894)

“WHERE GOLD GROWS ON COFFEE TREES”

“THE SIN OF ELECTROLYSIS”

“SIDE LIGHTS ON THE BATSON CASE”

ETC., ETC.



JULY, 1914

**NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
**Pasadena, California**

---

**Copyrighted in the United States and Great Britian,  
by the Author,  
1914**



E  
661.7  
D65a

DEDICATED  
TO  
DUDLEY H. NORRIS

My companion on certain Mexican missions, to whose brilliant wit, and intimate acquaintance with Mexico—territory, people, character, industries, literature, language and laws—I am much indebted for historical data in connection herewith.

—M. D.



*“ You shall not crucify us  
on a cross of gold.”*

*Neither shall you prostitute  
our dignity and power.*



# At the Edge of the Pit

---

## CHAPTER I.

*"We set up this nation and we proposed to set it up on the rights of man. We did not name any differences between one race and another; we did not set up any barriers against any particular race or people, but opened our gates to the world and said: 'All men who wish to be free, come to us and they will be welcome.'"*—President Wilson, July 4th, 1914.

There are five human races: In Africa the Ethiopian or Black; in America the Indian or Red; in Asia the Mongolian or Yellow, including the Chinese and Japanese and, also in Asia, the Malays or Brown, including the inhabitants of British India and in Europe the Caucasian or White.

At the time the Declaration of Independence was adopted all the representatives of the Ethiopian race in the United States were slaves of the whites. These slaves or their fathers had been seized in their native Africa, brought to America and sold into slavery, which continued for nearly a century more until they were freed by a Republican president. Ever since their emancipation and at the present time, in states dominated by the Democratic party all persons of African blood are disfranchised, not by law, but in fact.

The Indians were here when the whites came, in full possession of their territory and occupied with their own

pursuits. They have been exterminated by the whites and today by a long course of decisions of the United States courts the Indians do not own their lands, cannot sell or convey them and are included in a political class with minors, convicts and insane who have no civil rights.

The Asiatic races are practically excluded from this country and those here are in many states prohibited from owning land, from acquiring American citizenship and from other civil rights and thus out of the five races into which human beings are divided, four of them have met at the hands of the American people, with slavery, disfranchisement, extermination, exclusion and denial of the ordinary personal property and political rights enjoyed by "Americans." It is a fact too clear for argument that this is a white man's country and a white man's government and that other races, black, yellow, red and brown are not welcome.

Mr. Wilson touches on the Mexican question and says: "Eighty-five per cent of the Mexican people have not been allowed to have a look-in in regard to their Government and the rights which have been exercised by the other 15 per cent. Do you suppose that circumstance is not sometimes in my thoughts?"

These people disqualified are Mexican Indians but they are not disqualified by law any more than the negroes of Louisiana, Mississippi and other southern states under Democratic control are disqualified by law, whereas under the government of Mr. Wilson, American Indians do owe their disqualifications to positive statutory enactments. If Mr. Wilson's bosom, like Mr. Devery's of New York, is agitated by sympathy for the "down-trod," let him begin his charitable work at home among his own American Indians before going abroad for objects of sympathy.

In his interview with Sam Blythe in the Saturday Evening Post of May 25th, 1914, Mr. Wilson said: "We shall not demand a foot of territory nor a cent of money—except, of course, the settlement of such claims as may justly be made by American citizens for damages to their property during these disturbances. There will be no money demand in a national sense."

In the Niagara Falls mediation, Mr. Wilson repeated that there would be no indemnity demanded of Mexico, meaning, as before, that no national indemnity would be demanded for the expenses of the army and navy in occupying the Gulf Ports; but he emphatically says in the Blythe interview, that individual losses must be paid and he repeats this in his Fourth of July oration in these words: "You hear a great deal stated about the property loss in Mexico, and I deplore it with all my heart. Upon the conclusion of the present disturbed conditions in Mexico undoubtedly those who have lost property ought to be compensated."

Mexico and the Mexicans are welcome to such slight comfort as they may get from Mr. Wilson's pretty talk about the rights of man; but they must consider as ominous the threats contained in Mr. Wilson's two utterances quoted above that the losses of property due to the Mexican revolution must be paid.

It is well known that before the Madero revolution, foreigners owned by far the greater part of the capital invested in Mexico and that the part owned by Mexicans was almost wholly in real property, so that it is the literal truth that the business of Mexico was in the hands of foreigners. Notwithstanding these immense interests the foreigners had no voice in the conduct of public affairs and have since been absolutely powerless to defend their property, their liberty or even their lives against any

Mexican influence or person, whatever, who may have the means and disposition to injure them.

There are, more or less, 14,000 miles of railroad in Mexico mortgaged to foreigners as security for money loaned and in the public disturbances of the past three years the value of this security has been almost totally destroyed. The right of way has been torn up for fortifications, the rails have been heated in fires made of their own ties and bent and twisted past any further usefulness. The stations, warehouses and bridges have been looted, burned or dynamited. The rolling stock and engines have been misused and destroyed. There is no longer any railroad traffic in Mexico and no pretense of meeting financial obligations in the payment of interest on the money lent.

In like manner prosperous enterprises throughout Mexico, ranch, mine, factory, commercial and other industrial investments made by foreigners are ruined and looted. Cattle are driven off. Horses and other personal belongings that strike the fancy of the raiders are taken. Men are insulted and murdered. Women are outraged and wanton destruction of houses, machinery and improvements of all kinds goes on without interference and the vital question now is, not some fine point of international law, not as to firing a salute, but who is to be held accountable for all this injury? Who is going to pay the bill?

Mr. Wilson has twice said that these losses ought to be compensated; but by whom and how? The losses will be perhaps some \$700,000,000. Must these fall upon the original sufferer? Must the Mormon of Sonora go back to his looted and burned ranch and begin again from the ruins and rebuild with the chance of being compelled to flee for his life a few years hence when another revolu-



tion breaks out? Must the miner pump out his flooded mine, retimber his shafts and drifts, renew his rusted machinery and rebuild his reduction works, ready for the next self-proclaimed provisional president to lay waste? Must the railroad bond-holder rebuild and restock the railroads that do not belong to him in order to save something of his money lent? If not, who will pay? Will Congress consider that such an obligation springs from the Monroe Doctrine? Such a law would not get fifty votes. Will Congress pay the bill and charge it to Mexico? No such thing is possible. Mexico would repudiate the obligation and she could not pay if she wanted to. The situation is not entirely new. We had some such an experience in 1847. We were in possession of a considerable part of Mexico then and, by reason of our occupation of the Capital City of Mexico, in constructive possession of the entire country.

When Japan at the Portsmouth Conference claimed certain territory and an indemnity, the point was raised that no claim could be made unless based upon actual occupation of the territory claimed. The same point came up in the conference that followed the Russian war against Turkey and it is a well recognized principle. If we occupy Mexico City and keep it, that objection will not be urged and the programme of 1848 will serve for the new performance; but if we establish peace without occupying the City of Mexico, or if we evacuate after occupation, how shall we compel payment of our bill for damages? Mr. Wilson has declared most emphatically that we will not wage a war of conquest and he undoubtedly thinks he means it, but incidentally, after the battle of Cerro Gordo, in 1847, *General Scott in a proclamation issued to the people of Mexico assured them that he was not fighting against the people of Mexico but only against*

*their bad rulers.* This proclamation was considered a wonderful stroke of diplomacy on General Scott's part. At any rate he went on to Puebla and the City of Mexico and before he left that city the bad rulers of Mexico had been fined, more or less, *half the national domain and the United States had, counting Texas, doubled its area at Mexico's expense.*

In considering our relations with Mexico three elements must be kept in view: the character of the Mexican Indian, who after all comprises 15,000,000 out of 18,000,000 of the entire population of that country; the Spanish character and last, but not least, the Anglo-Saxon. Any one who really is acquainted with Mexico must realize that the Mexican Indian is just about the same as he was before Cortez landed on Mexican soil. He was not a Christian then and he cannot be called a Christian now. He is no more of the Christian religion than is the negro of Louisiana or the West Indies, the blanket Indian of our own western plains or the Chinese member of the Sunday School with the pretty teacher. Their religion is a form of semi-idolatry at the best. True, there is in Mexico a splendid Catholic hierarchy that up to a century ago was omnipotent in every department of life; but the poor Indian was no part of it any more than was the earth it rested on. There is only the fact that he has been baptized that gives any claim at all that he is a Christian.

In 1529, a Flemish monk, Peter of Ghent, said that he and another monk had converted 200,000 Mexicans, their ordinary work running as high as 10,000 in a single day. A few years after the conquest the monks reported the number of converts as 4,000,000. In the mountains not far from Mexico City can be seen today white worn as mourning; fireworks at funerals, tinsel crowns and fan-

tastic colored shrouds upon the dead and grotesque ceremonies on festive occasions that belonged to the ancient Aztec religions. At Christmas they enact the actual birth of Jesus. Mary appears, evidently about to become a mother, and after a triumphal procession the priest takes from beneath her skirts the infant Jesus, in swaddling bands, who is first placed upon the altar and then marched around the church.

An essential element of the Spanish character is cruelty. Cortez and his followers invaded and possessed the territory of the Mexicans, occupied their cities, took away their treasures, ravished their daughters, exterminated the resisting and converted, baptized and enslaved the survivors. The natives were held as the merest serfs and slaves, having no rights that a Spaniard was bound to respect. With the grant to Cortez of a vast tract of land near Cuernavaca was included, in so many words, the gift of 100,000 peons, over whom he had the power of life and death.

There remains the Anglo-Saxon, the corner stone of whose character is hypocrisy. Where the Spaniards sent their soldiers first and followed them up with their priests, we send our missionaries first and later on our soldiers. The savage is first converted and then conquered. He first comes to Jesus and then to John Bull. As Joseph Choate said, the Pilgrim Fathers on landing on Plymouth Rock, first fell upon their knees and then they fell upon the aborigines. And the most delicious part of it is the unconsciousness of the Anglo-Saxon of this trait of his character, due largely to a defective sense of humor and partly to the deadening effect of having been born that way. It is like garlic to an Italian. He has it every meal; he smells of it; but he is entirely unconscious of it. So when Mr. Wilson begged Congress

with tears in his voice to repeal the free canal tolls and alleged certain foreign diplomatic complications as his reason and afterward admitted that there were no such complications, he must not be charged with dishonesty nor in the alternative with lack of intelligence. He is a true Anglo-Saxon and when he says a thing, for the moment he honestly thinks that he believes it. The French have never understood our real honesty of purpose and they call England "Albion perfide."

The Abbe Domenech, a French attache of the court of the Mexican Emperor Maximillian, said that the English and the Americans had identical policies. In questions of honor and humanity that did not touch their interests they did not interfere; but in questions purely political or of national sympathy there was a great deal of noise but no drawing of the sword, but merely menace or concession according to the interest of the moment. Of the Americans he said that they knew how to clear up a country, to cultivate land, to make machines, as they do not in Europe; and further, that when the English prime minister took snuff the Washington cabinet sneezed.

Mr. Wilson said in the Blythe interview: "To some extent the situation in Mexico is similar to that in France at the time of the Revolution. There are wide differences in many ways, but the basic situation has many resemblances." It is not only similar to the French Revolution. It IS the French Revolution revived.

When the scientific expeditions were started on their way to rifle the ancient pyramids and royal tombs of Egypt, they made many wonderful discoveries. It was said that grains of wheat that had been buried with the dead were taken from the sepulchres and had sprouted and borne fruit after thousands of years of burial and fears were aroused that perhaps germs of diseases of

which the buried kings had died might still have the power to reproduce among the highly scientific and respectable grave robbers the plagues of the Pharoahs. Fortunately this did not come to pass and these worthy gentlemen were reserved for a less poetic fate. The Americans are responsible, however, for preserving in accessible form the microbes of the French Revolution which have inoculated Spanish America as they issued in a cloud from the opening of the Declaration of Independence in countries south of the Rio Grande.

The sentiment among all good Americans toward the Declaration of Independence is a sort of fetichism, as the essence of Americanism, whereas we have our doubts about the Constitution, judging from the unceasing attempts to change it. We look upon it as all good Christians look upon the Old Testament. We all believe in it, we are ready to fight for it,, but very few read it. Not one American in ten thousand ever read the Declaration all through, and ninety-nine out of a hundred will quote its best known phrase, "*All men are created free and equal.*" Most of the indictment part of the Declaration was the work of Benjamin Franklin. The introduction contains certain political doctrines generally supposed by all good Americans to have been original with Thomas Jefferson. As a matter of fact Jefferson took his ideas from Jean Jacques Rousseau, a brilliant Frenchman whose writings were most potent factors in the French Revolution. Jefferson first published the substance of the Declaration in 1774 and afterwards worked the same material into the Declaration two years later, a good deal like his great disciple Mr. Bryan, now Secretary of State, did with the Crown of Thorns and Cross of Gold, made them do double duty.

Rousseau's most famous followers were Robespierre,



the monster of the French Revolution, Jefferson and Theodore Roosevelt. Rousseau wrote on every topic under the sun and he had an adoring public to read his work. He urged, among other things, that French mothers nurse their babies, anticipating much of Roosevelt's writings on race suicide. When the Philadelphia convention, consisting largely of slave holders, decreed that all men were created equal it was not merely intended to mean that all men stood equal before the law; but it was an emphatic acceptance of the account of the creation as contained in the first chapter of Genesis. Man was created. In the language of the Bible, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" and instantly where there had been nothing the moment before, there stood Adam, freshly created and, according to the Declaration, endowed by his creator, presumably at the instant of creation, with life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, among other assets, such as tonsils and a veriform appendix, which, not mentioned by Mr. Jefferson in his list, were undoubtedly among those present. In France, eighteen years after the Declaration was adopted Robespierre, Rousseau's great disciple, caused to be enacted a law decreeing the immortality of the soul and another affirming the existence of the Supreme Being which was formally proclaimed and ratified on June 8th, 1794, in the city of Paris with great ceremony and known as the Feast of God at which Robespierre officiated as Pontiff.

One unfortunate phrase in the Declaration of Independence is that governments derive their just powers *from the consent of the governed*, and it is the unanimous belief *through all Spanish America*, that this means that if you don't like the existing government the Declaration of Independence is your warrant for revolting. That one phrase is a true Pandora's box and infinite loss, discord,

strife, bloodshed and war have been caused in Spanish America by it. There is only one other phrase like it. An old father of the church once exclaimed that the words "Search the Scriptures" had undone the World, meaning that thereby unbelief had been caused on the part of the searchers. Is it true that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed? Consider the case of a state's prison, and surely that is a part of government, or a regiment of conscripts enlisted against their will. Does the warden of the prison or the colonel of the regiment derive his just powers, or any powers at all, from the consent of his men? Absolutely not. The poor devils have no choice. Jefferson got this idea from Rousseau's "Social Contract" published in 1762. Rousseau was a poor student of history. His fervid imagination would not brook the drudgery of historical research and he jumped to the conclusion, absolutely without basis, that away back in antiquity the individuals composing human society voluntarily and unanimously entered into a contract among themselves providing for all the institutions of government and that this contract was binding upon their descendants forever. All were bound by it. Kings to govern, nobles to command and subjects to obey.

In his book on Rousseau, Lord Morley, the great English historian, sums up the social contract fallacy thus: "The obedience of the subject to the sovereign has its root not in contract but in force,—the force of the sovereign to punish disobedience. A man does not consent to be put to death if he shall commit a murder, for the reason alleged by Rousseau, namely, as a means of protecting his own life against murder. There is no consent in the transaction. Some person or persons possessed of sovereign authority, promulgated a command that the

subject should not commit murder and appointed penalties for such commission and it was not a fictitious assent to these penalties, but the fact that the sovereign was strong enough to enforce them, which made the command valid."

Some years ago typhoid fever broke out sporadically in many places in New York City but with no known source of infection. It was at length noticed that these outbreaks of typhoid followed the presence of a certain domestic servant who had been employed in every house where the fever afterwards appeared but who was herself free from the disease. On examination it was discovered that her clothing and personal belongings were infected with typhoid germs and "Typhoid Mary," as she was thereafter called, was sent to a public institution for fumigation. The Declaration of Independence, in respect of spreading the germs of revolution, is the Typhoid Mary of Spanish America.

The Declaration of Independence was intended for external application only: an irritant, a mustard plaster, and if by misadventure it is used internally it sets the patient ablaze.

The trim, black, rakish craft Declaration, her hull by Franklin and her top hamper by Rousseau, was gaily sent by Jefferson, the jolly Roger at her peak, upon her merry cruise of destruction. She is still cruising and Spanish America is still burning.

The true function of the Declaration of Independence was not as a statement of principles but as a declaration of war. It was a parley before the battle. In the play of Julius Caesar before the battle of Phillippi the opposing generals met and Brutus said: "Words before blows: Is it not so, countrymen?" Then Augustus answers: "Not that we love words better, as you do." Then follows more



naughty talk and the battle is on. In Henry V also the French heralds bandy insults with the English King. In one of the many wars between France and England the English commander invited the French general, "Fire, Gentlemen of the French Army," to which he answered, "Fire, Gentlemen of the English army, we never fire first.' Then some one blazed away and everybody joined in. Any overt act is enough to start a fight. "Do you bite your thumb at me, sir?" Boys put chips on their shoulders. Prize fighters and Mr. Roosevelt shy their casters into the ring but it all amounts to the same thing: "Come out, you cad, and fight." And that is all there is to the Declaration of Independence except that it gave a good Democrat, Mr. Jefferson, an opportunity to make a rattling good speech.

All attempts to realize in practice the French notions of liberty set forth in the Declaration of Independence have brought ruin. In the United States, from 1776, to the Constitutional Convention in 1787, the net results were general bankruptcy, Shay's rebellion, anarchy and state nullification of laws passed by Congress; in France, the Reign of Terror, with the Empire as a sequence and in Spanish America, never-ending revolutions. The Spanish American interprets the promises offered as meaning not only mere animal existence, but the means of living also. Liberty, he considers as absence of governmental restraint and the happiness which he deems his due is that it shall come to him without work. A very pretty philosophy, "The world owes us a living. Let's have a dance." Under the directory this philosophy was tried. In Paris there was absolute personal liberty in private life and individual immorality was rampant. Never was Paris gayer. Never in the history of modern fashions had women in decent social position gone so scantily and so voluptuously clad and the typical male Parisian was a

simpering man of fashion whose conversation may be summed up in the continual repetition in a high falsetto: "C' est incroyable." (It is incredible.) The materials of his costume were of gorgeous silks and satins; the trousers tight fitting, with the waist line high up under the arms, a fancy waistcoat, a high collar and stock, a "swallow tailed" coat with a short body, a narrow coat tail reaching to the ground, an immense beaver hat, the whole on a foundation of supporting foot straps. So completely had he and the costume become associated with the word "Incroyable" that they are known in history as the "Incroyables" and the French influence over American ideas and politics is shown in that Uncle Sam, the one figure typifying American nationality, as John Bull typifies the British, is always dressed in the costume worn by the French Dandy of the bloodiest epoch of modern history, by the *Incroyable* of the Reign of Terror.

Though the Declaration of Independence is a direct importation from France, the Constitution is a purely American product. We had, of course, the English common law and the example of the English government; but there had never been a representative of the royal authority on this side of the water and when the American colonies achieved their independence there were thirteen lines of communication cut and the general government, yet to be established, must be accepted by each colony to make it binding on all. After over eleven years of the Confederation and its inadequacy proved, the Constitution was framed and adopted. Of the two documents it is true that the Declaration of Independence was the work of the Democratic party and the Constitution was the work of the Federalist party. Jefferson had no part in making the Constitution. He was not even a delegate to the convention, being in the government service abroad.

Jefferson was not in sympathy with the Constitution. He had no recent experience in constructive government and he had not advanced in the intervening years beyond the Declaration of Independence. He was still toying with liberty after it had under the Confederation degenerated into practical anarchy, whereas the delegates to the Constitutional convention believed that society exists for the preservation of property.

This is the lesson that Spanish America has still to learn. Better for them had the Declaration of Independence never been written, than that they suffer the horrors of the French revolution, even to the alleged erection of a guillotine in a Mexican village. It is useless to merely copy a foreign constitution that is not the outgrowth of the national life. When Mexico became free there was a representative in that country of the royal authority, the Viceroy, and when the separation came but one line of communication was severed, that between the Viceroy and the king. The relations existing between the Viceroy and the rest of Mexico were not changed, except in name. It is true enough that there was a rechristening all around and the Viceroy was called the President and the former provinces were now independent and sovereign states, if you believe the letter of their laws, which the Good Book says killeth; but the fact remains that the chief executive of Mexico still wields the power of both Viceroy and king and the various constituent divisions of the country are as completely under his domination as they ever were, anything to the contrary contained in the Mexican constitution, notwithstanding.

The Confederation, after the Colonies became independent, followed the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Everybody was free. There was no national authority. The government was bankrupt. Congress

passed laws which had to be approved by the states and after eleven years of chaos under Jeffersonian principles, the Declaration was abandoned and the constitution was adopted. It was a compromise and there were a number of amendments that were afterwards adopted which added to its efficiency. The Federal government came into possession of the lands of the Western Reserve, consisting of all the territory west of the present boundaries of the original thirteen states. This was a great source of wealth to the government, established its financial credit and with the new Federalist constitution the nation started on its wonderful career, the basis of which was not so much liberty as wealth.

After twelve years of federal administration under Washington and John Adams, the Democrats under Jefferson came into power. The constitution did not satisfy Hamilton because the Federal authority was restricted and it did not satisfy Jefferson because the same authority was too great. John Adams named as chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Marshall, who stands with Washington and Hamilton as the greatest of American statesmen,—Marshall's decisions uniformly favored the extension of the Federal authority and made the Supreme Court, and not Congress, the greatest power in the government. Jefferson hated Marshall and Madison nominated Story to the Supreme Court to counteract Marshall's influence, but Story agreed with the views of Marshall and the work of the court continued along the lines established.

History truly does repeat itself. In the good old days of King John of England there was trouble between the King and the pope over the appointment of Steven Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury and as a result the pope first issued an interdict and then a bull of excommunica-

tion against John and for years England suffered almost the horrors of civil war. At length the pope declared the throne of England vacant and bestowed it on Philip of France who promptly prepared to cross the channel and take possession; but John had had enough, so he gave up the fight, saluted the flag, was forgiven by the pope and became a favored son of the church. This goes to show what a vast amount of damage to an entire nation can be caused by the irresponsible whim of a truly good man, and of course the pope must have been a truly good man or he couldn't have been pope.

A government is like a corporation, a bank, a railroad, or a person, natural or artificial. It exists by reason of its inherent strength, of its ability to maintain itself. The rule of life is "Eat or be eaten" and the new beatitude is "Blessed are the fittest for they shall survive."

Liberty, freedom from restraint, is not the birthright of the individual; rather the reverse, subjection, slavery, if you will. Helpless infancy, childhood and adolescence, all find us in a position of utter dependence. We must be supported during these years, fed, clothed, and educated. With manhood comes the necessity of finding visible means of support, failing which man becomes a vagrant, a criminal, degraded and outcast. If he succeeds in life he is the slave of his employment, of his business, of the conventionalities that society imposes upon him and the greater his success, the stronger his obligations and the less his true liberty.

The real Mexican question is "WHO IS GOING TO PAY THE BILL?" And in this connection it may be further asked, "WHERE IS THE MONEY TO COME FROM?" After the various presidents, provisional and otherwise, have thoroughly exhausted that country and peace reigns in Mexico as it reigned in Warsaw, a gov-



ernment may arise sufficiently stable to receive the claims of the foreigners who have suffered in person and estate during the long period of unrest.

Ignoring for the moment the greatest of the foreign claimants, the Americans, there are the Spaniards, in whose hands are the sugar and grocery trades and whose shops, all over the republic, have been looted and whose people have been robbed, tortured, murdered and expelled. Then come the French, who control the dry goods trade and who are bankers and miners; the Germans, who have the hardware trades, mines and metallurgical works; the Belgians, railroad securities, and finally the English, as owners or mortgagees of the Mexican, Inter-oceanic, Tehuantepec, Southern, North-Western and National railroads, oil wells and refineries at Tampico, and in Vera Cruz and ranches and industrial establishments all over the country. ALL these foreign claimants have suffered spoliation, robbery, insult and murder and all are holders of Mexican securities on which default has been made.

The time will come when the claims for damage will be demanded. Can Mexico pay without intolerant taxation, which impost, will engender further revolutions? Can Mexico pay the bill at all? It is doubtful.

The situation today is practically identical with that of 1861 when the Convention was held in London and the claims against Mexico were urged by the governments of France, England and Spain for losses of their subjects.

The result was, even as today, that Vera Cruz was occupied not by Americans but by the allied forces of France, England and Spain in support of the allies' demand for the payment of claims.

The United States offered to assume Mexico's indebtedness and England and Spain withdrew, but the United States were then in the toils of civil war and the security did not satisfy Napoleon III and French troops were landed, notwithstanding the Monroe Doctrine, and there followed the Franco-Mexican intervention, and the Emperor, Maximilian.

In the meantime the American claimants are heard from and in no uncertain tones demand that the Washington government protect them and that their interests do not suffer in competition with the NON AMERICAN foreign claimants. One of three courses must be taken by the United States: First, They may refuse to entertain any proposition whatever from the non-American foreign claimants, leaving them free to make their naval demonstration, land their troops, occupy the custom houses and collect their claims. If with their refusal the United States declare that such landing and occupation would be construed as unfriendly acts, and the unfriendly acts were committed there would result practically a case of war with the allied claimants. Second: The United States might approve of the joint occupation, take part in the naval demonstration and receive a due share of the customs receipts.

In both of these two cases, involving either joint or non American foreign intervention in Mexico, that would be the last of the Monroe doctrine and the partition of Latin America among the nations of Europe would follow as a matter of course and at their convenience. The Japanese could establish themselves at Magdalena Bay, the Germans at some desirable Central American point and a few European regiments would make short work of taking the Panama Canal by attacking on the land side and holding one of the Pacific locks.

But one other course remains, the American occupation of Mexico and the payment of all foreign claimants with money advanced by the United States. No partial or temporary occupation will be enough,—we tried that sixty odd years ago, but all of it and permanently. But that would mean a war of aggression and Mr. Wilson has said that he is opposed to wars of aggression and when he said it he undoubtedly meant it. Even so, but Mr. Wilson's mind is easily changed and if he remains obdurate his successor will be chosen in 1916 and a candidate standing on a platform of complete and permanent occupation of Mexico would sweep the country.

Occupation is the only solution and it is most desired by the Mexicans themselves. The Mexican working man, mechanic, miner, or peon would get a white man's wages. The land question would solve itself, the great holdings being subdivided and sold to foreign immigrants. A great influx of foreigners from Europe and the United States would change the complexion of the people and they would control the country's politics. About three million blondes would turn the trick.

As to the principles of international law involved, they are neither numerous nor complicated. Wherever territory is occupied by a weaker nation who misgoverns that territory or for any reason its further occupancy runs counter to the interests of a stronger nation who covets its possession, the territory must be surrendered. This is the history of universal spoliation during the past century and the victims have been Turks, Chinese, Koreans, Apaches, Africans, Seminoles, Poles, Arabs, Egyptians, Boers, Moors, Maoris, Modocs and Mexicans.



## CHAPTER II.

"Regular troops alone are equal to the exigencies of modern war, as well for defense, as offense, and where a substitute is attempted, it must prove illusory and ruinous.

"No militia will ever acquire the habits necessary to resist a regular force. The firmness requisite for the real business of fighting is only to be obtained by a constant course of discipline and service.

"It is most earnestly to be desired, that the liberties of America may no longer be trusted, in a material degree, to so precarious a defense."—Washington.

"Our mobile army is so ridiculously small in the world's war game, that it amounts to nothing better than a discard!"—Adna R. Chaffee, Lieutenant Gen. U. S. Army, Retired.

"The frontiers of states are either rivers or mountains or *deserts*. Of all these obstacles to the march of an army, the most difficult to overcome *is the desert*. Mountains come next and broad rivers occupy the third place."—Napoleon.

## HINDSIGHT BETTER THAN FORESIGHT.

The evolution of warfare is kaleidoscopic, so also are armaments and conditions.

Preparedness in a conflict with Mexico, for instance, would materially differ from factors governing preparations for war with a first class military power.

\*“Whenever a nation’s attitude towards war is evasive, its conduct indecisive and its preparation an indifferent, orderless assembling of forces, it prepares for defeat.

“There is always *certainty in determining a Nation’s probable adversaries*, within such periods of time, as to permit preparedness, the adoption of armaments to specific purposes and defined theatre of war.”

If the trained mind searches into the technicalities of the strategical and military situation of the United States, logical conclusions of an unbiased nature would undermine the existing vanity of its alleged strength and efficiency. To assume that the United States at this time could repulse a first class power invading the Pacific coast is fallacious and it would be well to prepare against such a contingency.

To imagine the country, in a state of unpreparedness, could defend itself against a prepared power is illusory. The money power, no matter how great, would be of no effect, for the reason, that under present conditions it would take two years to obtain adequate war material and one year, at least, to train and discipline men. The raw material for the making of an army is here, but raw material is in most instances, less valuable than the finished product, so the two years in question would be the *ne plus ultra* of the effort to defend an extended and vigorous attack with modern equipment. The ease with which this mosaic of empires has grown opulent is the cause of its ascent to heights of mistaken military heroics, the absurdity of which is only realized in the War Department, and also thoroughly recognized by the military attaches and heads of foreign embassies at Wash-

---

\*Homer Lea.

ington. The United States has never seen a real war on land with modern equipment.

Because the United States was victor in '79 and 1812 and the "North and the South" participated in a man to manslaughter from 1861 to '65, and again in 1898 were victors over an already half conquered and more or less decadent army of starving and shoeless Spanish boy soldiers, four thousand miles from their base of supplies, it does not follow that foreign conditions of transport, armaments, military science and alliances have not completely altered in two decades. They certainly have since Yorktown and Gettysburg.

It is a case of stumbling along on the doubtful military glories of the past, of the days of "Indians" and the days of the smooth bore, without realizing (outside military circles) that today battles are won by the ton weight of metal placed on a given spot in the shortest space of time.

The history of the world shows the decline of one nation after another, when the nation became opulent and arrogant. The United States has become both. It does not realize the latter and gloats over the former. So that invariable law of predestined descent will move toward it as surely as there are, armed to the teeth, nations to the East, West and South.

In 1898 war was declared by the United States against Spain as the outcome of the insurgent condition of Cuba. At this time General Weyler, the Spanish Captain-General of the Island, had, by severe military methods, about accomplished its pacification. His methods were about the same as those adopted by the English in Afghanistan, Egypt, and South Africa, or those methods adopted by the French and Germans in North and Southwest Africa respectively.

The hysterical press of the country, after the accident to the United States battleship "Maine," forced President McKinley's hand, opposed as he was personally to war, and the Congress, in response to the attitude of the Press which quickly moulded public opinion, declared war in April, 1898.

The press allegations were that in the preceeding February the Spanish blew up the "Maine" whilst at anchor in the harbor of Havana. It may be said that these premature statements misled public opinion and were in a large measure (little was said of the commercialists at the doors of the Senate Chamber) the cause of the declaration of war which followed a few weeks after, even more so than the then existing condition of relations with Spain or any misplaced hysterical sympathy with the Cuban insurrectionists. America never participated in a more unjust or unnecessary war.

The very cause of the inflamed condition of public opinion was the loss of the ship. Today the active cause of the Maine's loss is a matter of conjecture and conjectural it must remain in the minds of the most bigoted. The most forceful arguments only went to show that the allegations were based upon hearsay and no proof was ever forthcoming against the Spanish.

In 1905 many people became participants in the purchase of the battleship Maine, then at the bottom of Havana harbor. The purchasers arranged with Mr. E. Corthell, the late state engineer of the State of New York, to submit plans to raise it. Mr. Corthell submitted plans and preparations to that end commenced.

The purchase of the ship came about in this way:

The Cuban government demanded of the United States government that it remove the ship from Havana harbor, as it was and had been for eight years, an obstruction

and menace to navigation. The demand passed from the treasury department to the state department. Mr. John Hay, then Secretary of State, replied to the Cuban government in words to the effect that the United States government relinquished all claims in respect to the ship to the Cuban government, as it was in their waters and harbor and if they wished it removed, there was no objection on the part of the United States government, to the Cuban government taking possession of and removing it. Whereupon the Cuban Government promptly sold the wreck, under this relinquishment, to Messrs. DeWyckoff, Petzold & Company for cash, coupled with a contract that the purchasers should raise it in accordance with the reply from the Department of State, and over the signature of the Secretary of State of the United States.

When the sale became public, there was a great deal of speculative comment as to the cause of the ship's foundering being revealed; this together with a wail of sentimental public disapproval, resulted in Mr. Hay's letter of relinquishment being deemed invalid by Mr. Roosevelt, who stated that Congress would have to pass on Mr. Hay's decision. As a consequence of this decision, the purchasers lost the ship and never recovered their purchase price from the Cuban government. The "Maine" was subsequently floated by the United States government at public expense, towed into deep water outside Havana and sunk in the Florida strait.

Immediately following the wreck of the "Maine" the disordered condition of the public mind was expressed in slogans relative to it, such as "Lest we forget," "Remember the Maine," etc. Not one thought was given to the possible cause, of the disaster.

The early reports of the divers submitted to the inves-



tigating committee stated that they (the divers) found and walked upon specified plates of the ship partially buried in the mud, in the vicinity of and outside of the wreck. A careful reading of these reports indicate that these plates were blown out or from the ship.

Let it be borne in mind that the "Maine" was notorious for its bad ventilation, and that it was coaled with a quality of soft or bituminous coal known to contain a very high percentage of volatile carbon. The wing bunkers were in the vicinity of the storage of ten inch shells. Assume that a man entered these bunkers with a naked light, which is now against regulations, or lighted a match, the possibility of an explosion of coal gas remains, which might account for the first explosion, and the second, in the shell room, is to be accounted for by communication from the first. Under these conditions the plates would be blown out.

The public never gave Spain the benefit of this possibility, nor for the rescue of the American sailors by the crew of the Spanish man-of-war then at anchor a few fathoms away. *The press drove the people, the Congress and the Senate, war mad.*

The Spanish people and officers of the Spanish army and navy, were hurt and staggered at the accusation, and the Cubans gloated over the disaster and the result it effected.

Years after the war, high Spanish officials begged the men of Spain to abstain from shaving for one day, and to contribute the amount saved by that abstention to a fund to be devoted to an endeavor to prove their innocence of complicity in the ship's destruction. But the United States government made its utilization impossible by pandering to the sentimentality of the electorate, by first refusing to permit outside interests to raise the

vessel, and secondly by sinking it in three thousand feet of water immediately after floating it at great cost to the government. The noble and "large thing," to have done, as Mr. Wilson puts it, would have been to invite an international commission of naval officers, including Spanish, to examine the ship on flotation, and to have determined forever the cause of the disaster, at that international Supreme Court of unbiased naval efficiency in session. At least such a procedure would have been eminently satisfactory to the world and especially so to the honor of Spain.

## CHAPTER III.

The Spanish-American war, just or unjust, confirmed Washington's letter to Congress of September 24, 1776, in which he expressed his estimation of militia and volunteers :

"To place any dependence upon militia is assuredly resting upon a broken staff. Men just dragged from the tender scenes of domestic life, unaccustomed to the din of arms, totally unacquainted with every kind of military skill (which is followed by want of confidence in themselves when opposed by troops regularly trained, disciplined, and appointed, superior in knowledge and superior in arms), are timid and ready to fly from their own shadows.

"Besides the sudden change in their manner of living, particularly in their lodging, brings on sickness in many, impatience in all, and such an unconquerable desire of returning to their respective homes, that it not only produces shameful and scandalous desertions among themselves, but infuses a like spirit in others. Again, men accustomed to unbounded freedom and no control, cannot brook the restraint which is indispensibly necessary to the good order and government of an army, without which licentiousness and every kind of disorder triumphantly reign. To bring men to a proper degree of subordination is not the work of a day or a month, or even a year. . . . Certain I am that it would be cheaper to keep fifty thousand or one hundred thousand in constant pay than to depend upon half the number



and supply the other half occasionally by militia. The time the latter are in pay before and after they are in camp, assembling and marching, the waste of ammunition, the consumption of stores, which, in spite of every resolution or requisition of Congress, they must be furnished with or sent home, added to other incidental expenses consequent upon their coming and conduct in camp, surpass all idea and destroy every kind of regularity and economy which you could establish among fixed and settled troops, and will in my opinion, prove, if the scheme is adhered to, the ruin of our cause."

The strength of the United States army during the war of 1898 was about 170,000. The number admitted to hospital during the five months, April to September, 1898, was over 158,000, or 90 per cent. of the force. In April, May and June of that year, these men had passed severe medical examinations for fitness. Of this army only 38,000 participated in the war, and the actual casualties in the field, including the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Cuba, amounted to 293 and 1032 from disease. In United States camps (Chicamaugua and Key West) the deaths from disease were 2649.

The Japanese surgeon-general (reserve) to the Imperial Japanese Navy, Baron Takaki, reports relative to the Russo-Japanese war: "*Four deaths from bullets to one from disease.*"

*In the Spanish war (1898) the United States lost four from bullets to 56 from disease.*

Japan had 1,500,000 men in the field during their last war. From this host, their loss was only 4073 deaths from typhoid and 1804 from dysentery.

The discipline of the American Volunteers at the time of the Spanish war was in keeping with the splendid spirit of individual American freedom and independence

and quite consistent with the teaching of the constitution.

One national guard state regiment, when called upon for active service by the Federal government, declined to serve. They would not and did not serve and that settled it. The assigned cause was that the men declined to serve under efficient United States (Federal) Army officers. They preferred their own untrained civilian officers.

It is true, however, that some men of this regiment volunteered to other state regiments that went to the front and who were not so particular.

Similar incidents have happened at the time of great strikes, when State regiments, after having been called out by the State government, have thrown down their arms and returned peacefully to their homes, when their officers commanded them to fire on riotous, incendiary and murderous mobs composed mostly of aliens.

Yet these men have been permitted by the individual State to retain their arms and their uniforms. So even after a hundred years, Washington's judgment is proved sound.

The landing of troops in 1898 at Siboney, on the south coast of Cuba, was attended by confusion. Ammunition, commissary supplies and equipment remained on the beach without organized military system, only some sixteen miles from Santiago where the main force of the Spanish army was centered. During that period of organization, the Spanish could have descended from the foot hills of the south mountain range they occupied immediately above and commanding the United States army's position, and driven the entire United States forces into the Carribean. The fleet lying off Siboney could not protect them, as their fire would have been as dangerous to United States troops as to the enemy during an attack.

This condition existed for many days and was keenly realized by many officers of the invading army.

One very prominent volunteer cavalry officer said in the hearing of a sentry at the time, referring to a general who was abnormally stout: "If we had a little more brains and a little less 'guts' we should not be in this position." Someone said he would rather be right than be President. Probably the cavalry officer was not of the same opinion.

However, the Spanish did not take advantage of the position. The naval engagement followed, resulting in the entire destruction of the Spanish fleet. This subsequently resulted in a formal investigation of the United States Admiral (Schley) commanding the action.

The charge developed in this way: The United States fleet had for weeks, under Admiral Samson, blockaded and unsuccessfully bombarded the Morro and Cabanas forts at Havana and the Spanish ship *Reina Christina* had escaped from that harbor with some forty million dollars.

Following this the United States fleet concentrated off Santiago harbor, therein "bottling up" Admiral Cervera's fleet.

The "American" operations were in command of Admiral Samson with Admiral Schley second in command. The Admiral in command (Samson) on the "New York" left the fleet and proceeded to a point some twelve miles to the east off Siboney. During his absence the Spanish fleet emerged from the harbor and a running fight ensued in a westerly direction under Admiral Schley. Admiral Samson was necessarily left behind. Had Admiral Cervera's fleet steered east instead of west the flagship "New York" could have been the focus of Cervera's concentrated fire. As the Spanish fleet came out of the har-

bor, Schley, to avoid being rammed and in order to make his fire more effective, executed his famous "loop" which manœuver probably saved his ship. This evolution was enlarged upon in a derogatory way at the Court of Inquiry and his tactics questioned despite his decisive victory.

His endeavor to immediately communicate the victory to his government, in the absence of Admiral Samson, was also a cause of great factional official dissatisfaction. To a great extent, politics, press criticism and prize money entered into the distasteful incident. The indignity to which he was subjected was unjust.

"Put not your trust in Princes" is a saying trite with truth, but the ingratitude of a republic was never on any occasion demonstrated in a higher degree.

The public exploitation of the incident was not conducive to good feeling, nor did it accomplish anything.

If the Maine had anything to do with United States intervention in Cuba, it may also be accepted that the Navy precipitated reprisals in Mexico, another Latin-American country. It occupied Vera Cruz, admittedly not to protect foreign lives and interests, but to sustain its dignity, also to prevent the landing of French and German war material about to arrive there on the Hamburg-American steamer "Ypiranga."

This German ship carried guns and ammunition consigned to the Mexican Government and this government had been recognized by European and other Courts. The United States Navy prohibited the landing of this cargo, although at this time the Administration at Washington was loud in its protestations that no condition of war existed against the Mexican people. Simultaneously with this action, arms and war material were passing to the insurrectionists from the United States, across the Texas

frontier, by the edict of the United States Government. Clearly these conditions demonstrated an act of partisanship and not one of neutrality. The position taken by the United States Department of State appeared inexplicable in this respect as the insurrectionists and not Huerta's men were responsible for the murder of many United States citizens and foreigners.

The landing of marines and the ensuing skirmish was an act of war. The referred to partisanship could easily have been regarded as an act of war by the *de facto* Mexican Government. The departure of the representatives of governments from the capitals of countries whose relations are strained is looked upon as preliminary to a declaration of war, and these departures took place. The Americans killed during the landing and occupation of Vera Cruz constituted a cause for war, but the Democratic administration of the United States hesitated to press matters. As a matter of fact it feared the declaration would come from Mexico. Unpreparedness was the cause of the peace-at-any-price policy, and startling as that may appear, it is a better reason than the other one that has been attributed to the administration's attitude.

There is not a great nation existing, worth the name of a nation, that has become one except through war.

If the United States would maintain its prestige with those nations it must protect its citizens abroad, not only with verbal force but with armed force when necessary. The same applies to its Pacific and Atlantic expansion. To expect that money alone and always can achieve success in colonial expansion and maintain protection for its citizens and dignity for itself, is a fallacy.

The efforts of the United States to placate General Huerta by resorting to the good offices of Argentine, Brazil and Chili, in an endeavor to effect an amicable



settlement for his refusal to fire the salute demanded, creates the impression that the United States pandered to General Huerta by choosing mediators of similar blood and tongue. If this is correct, the foreign policy of the United States and its reading of Latin-American character was defective. The "backdown" and hesitation displayed by the United States after its occupancy of Vera Cruz was not a colossal triumph, either in diplomacy or intervention, and anger brooded over both lands. It did not, and such vacillation will not in the future, engender wholesome respect for American citizens from Latin America. The position taken by the United States was only in effect palliative, and varnished over a bad condition of affairs: and then war was inconvenient.

An element of great weakness in a military sense is seen in the sociological condition of the United States which is unique in the history of peoples. There is no homeogeneity of nationality and owing to this condition, selfish interests demand priority over permanent military efficiency.

Since President Polk the national racial complexion has altered by the introduction of many millions of Europeans of varied nationalities. This has entirely submerged the American individuality.\*

The immigrant of 1850 readily assimilated. In 1914 the various nationalisms are conserved, perpetuated, and

---

\*The total immigrants from 1824 to 1912 numbered 29,611,000. In 1911-12 Italy sent 340,000; Austria, 337,000; Russian, 220,121. All Europe in those two years contributed 1,483,632; Asia, 40,000; Latin America, 200,000. The language of the country is dialectic and is no longer English in its pronunciation. It is known as the United States language and words of German, Yiddish and European languages are introduced into its use proportionately with the nationality and numbers in certain centers of alien population. Many thousands speak only their national tongue. On the other hand many families conserve their national language after three generations.



imperfect amalgamation exists. There are the Irish-Americans, German-Americans, Scandinavian-Americans, Pennsylvania-Dutch-Americans, Chinese-Americans, and there are 11,200,000 civilized American negroes to-day. There are few homogeneous Americans, except the descendants of the early Dutch and English Pilgrims and Puritans and the cavalier Virginia Colonists, whose American identity has not become merged in the sociological re-constitution.\*

A vast proletariat (with a vote) is the result of the immigratory influx, polyglot in tongue and heterogeneous in nationality, always with a large proportion retaining the sentiments, customs and religion of their original nationality. This condition has not developed a high standard of life.

\*\*The military (and naval) rank and file contain a large number of this element, and it is "food for thought" how many of these would be available in war against their own nation, in the event of hostilities between that nation and the United States, or how many United States citizens of European or Asiatic extraction, composing the proletariat, would in the event of war return, despite their citizenship, to their native countries and regiments where they were conscripted.

---

\*The "German vote" and the "Irish vote" is a great factor in determining the result of presidential elections, to say little of the negro vote.

\*\*During the recent Balkan war, thousands of Albanians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Montenegrins and Turks left the United States and returned to their regimental colors.

## CHAPTER IV.

The more recent administrations, elected under existing political and social conditions, have become isolated in their international relationships. Transitory ignorance has possessed the politician-diplomat and when this has not been the case the "mob mind" of the electorate has domineered the party administration whose patronage dictated the appointment.

Under these conditions of defective diplomacy the probabilities of war are increased.

## EXTRAORDINARY CONDITIONS.

I. The quadrennial family (election) quarrel and its sequence, viz: the struggle for office, to which all questions of a foreign and domestic nature are subordinated. The stagnation of commerce and industry pending the outcome, for one year in advance of, and one year after, the "quarrel" is temporarily suspended.

II. A navy, without a foreign-going mercantile marine to convoy, except through a Canadian canal and that limited in capacity to the size of torpedo boats. A Navy without United States ships to coal it, and without Pacific Coast coaling stations. A navy, whose officers complain of a shortage of war material. This may be correct considering the large amount of condemned ammunition returned from the Philippines.

III. An army of a million men (all sources) of which 914,000 are untrained and undisciplined, or pro rata with the index estimate.

iv. Inadequate war material to supply the now world-widely distributed 86,000 trained men composing the Federal Army in a six months campaign. For a more extended period of military operations it would take the country two years to manufacture an effective quantity in advance of extended military operations, and money could not purchase it abroad after a declaration of war. At least not *in time* to be effective.

v. The tirades of abuse directed by the press adherents of each great political party, against the now triangular opposition. In many cases this is vindictive in allegations and the foreign powers, constituting the "outside world," recognize that political concretism exists, while the Latin-American, without exception, laughs superciliously in his cuff, and determines that his method of bayonet to decide the ballot is preferable in presidential elections and issues.

The press has the power of moulding the vote of the proletariat and consequently the verdict of the issue. In addition thereto, it has the power to comment and lead opinion *sub judice* in cases both civil and criminal. Pernicious bias is exhibited in many instances and this creates prejudice, resulting in civil, criminal and political injustice. Thus the press of the country is directly the political creative and governing power. The press is the government, and it is to its great influence that beneficial or harmful results may be traced. In other words, that which is entirely outside of government control, creates and controls.

vi. A diplomatic corps, chiefly selected by political party preference. Competent? Yes!—in the lines of the various professions from which its members are graduated, but rarely diplomatists.

With this system officially and legally tolerated, and a public absorbing with avidity the extravagant statements made, it cannot be expected that men of code and of the better element will subject themselves to the yellow rays, which become the penalty of association with politics. Consequently, the admitted popular opinion that most politicians enter politics for no other reason than for the betterment of their material condition of life, may be assumed to be nearly correct.

Unfortunately, in "America" patriotism has become subordinate in ratio to profit or patronage according to the skin thickness of the individual politician, who can always create noisy appreciation from the electorate by the voicing of it in the oratorical waving of the flag. The true extent of his real patriotism is an  $x$  quantity as it also is with a great many of his adherents, whose patriotic instincts extend more to Hibernianism or the Teutonic beer than to the flag representing the forty-eight sovereignties of local divergent interests.

VII. Misunderstandings exist in Mexico as a result of the Huerta bungle. All the Powers recognized Huerta's Government except the United States of America, and naturally expected that the United States would intervene *to protect foreign lives and property*, since the United States might consider it an unfriendly act should foreign powers individually or in concert forcibly attempt to do so. The United States Government did not recognize Huerta's presidency nor did it protect "American" lives or property during the years of anarchistic terror on the United States frontier and south of it. At least one or the other of these alternatives should have been early effected, especially so since the non-recognition of General Huerta by the United States assisted in maturing the existing Mexican conditions. The pacific attitude

adopted was not in accord with the alleged military and naval strength of the country in the face of atrocities to United States men and women, and caused serious loss of prestige to the United States throughout Latin America.

VIII. Japan looks askance at the attempt of the United States for Pacific expansion. Japan resents the Californian attitude, and the powerlessness of the Federal Government to control it, develops the question of States rights. Japan resents Magdalena Bay and the fortification of the Hawaiian Islands and is *preparing for the issue*, which must come to determine the supremacy of the Pacific, in a manner pregnant with determination, skill of strategy and forethought which is as patent to-day to the students of the situation as it will be surprising, startling and successful in its execution.

ix. England, by virtue of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, won for herself a diplomatic victory which may have its effect on internal affairs in the near future, and on external affairs for a long period. But England in reality may not be quite so satisfied as the attitude of its foreign office indicates, over the ostensibly indifferent attitude of the United States on Mexican and Panama questions. The same applies in this particular to Germany and Spain.

x. Colombia was recently dismembered by the assistance of a previous United States administration.

\*The assistance lent by the United States to the Panama revolutionists and the almost instant recognition of that republic by the United States when it seceded from Colombian rule, would have been considered an act of war under the Monroe Doctrine, had England, for in-

---

\*See Mr. Clark's admission of this in his speech before Congress, March 5, 1914.



stance, employed such methods in this connection. Yet in the minds of most people the Monroe Doctrine has been construed to effect the *protection* of all Latin America from aggression or acquisition. The United States, by virtue of Mr. Olney's interpretation of it, constituted itself the sole dictator of Latin America, even though Latin America did not wish to be so dictated to or "protected," and at heart resents the intrusion. Colombia was a victim of this doctrine. It was not a European power that established formidable fortifications on the Canal Zone of Panama, but the very protector who assisted in filching it and after a lapse of eight years proposes to hand to the Colombian Government \$25,000,000 as an indemnity or bid for friendship, and the Colombian Government will accept them for no other reason than that the payment of the sum complies with terms asked for the canal concession.

On May 6, 1914, Mr. Roosevelt expressed his attitude as follows:

"Colombia agreed to let us build the canal on payment of \$10,000,000. Later she tried to blackmail the United States when she thought France would give \$25,000,000. Panama rose in revolt, insisting that the American agreement should stand.

"Not one dollar can be paid Colombia with propriety or morally, and it would be an act of infamy to pay even a dollar to a nation which in crooked greed tried desperate blackmail.

"To besmirch the good name of America by such payment would be an act unworthy any honorable man in the great office of President. To yield the Panama tolls rights would be equally dishonorable."

If this is Ex-President Roosevelt's opinion, it would appear that he forgets that at the time Colombia asked



\$25,000,000 for the Panama Canal concession, the State of Panama with its 31,000 square miles of territory formed an integral part of the Republic of Colombia, and this being the case, Colombia had the right to ask whatever it pleased for the right to construct a canal through its territory. Colombia's demand, under these circumstances, could scarcely be termed "blackmail."

The State of Panama was assisted to secede from Colombia and received \$10,000,000 from the United States. Mr. Wilson now proposes to set this right with Colombia, and his just attitude naturally makes Mr. Roosevelt's ready recognition of the Republic of Panama, plus \$10,000,000, look a trifle awkward.

The \$25,000,000 this administration proposes to pay to the Republic of Colombia is not a very great sum for the loss of one of its nine states, more especially as Columbia never received a dollar from the United States for the canal concession although Colombia's rights were recognized by France and received a substantial sum from M. de Lesseps.

## CHAPTER V.

The parallel conditions of unrest in Panama in 1903 and in Mexico in 1913-14 are obvious. Mr. Roosevelt claims the 1903 situation justified intervention because of President San Clamente's death in prison and Maroquin's usurpation of the Presidency coupled by fifty-three instances of riot and revolution, coupled with the threatened interruption of traffic across the isthmus over the Inter-Oceanic Railway. If intervention and subsequent occupation was justified from these causes how much greater are the causes for firm intervention in Mexico where United States citizens have been murdered and United States women raped. The commercial side of the question as between Panama and Mexico bears little relation in magnitude as the Mexican situation involves hundreds of millions of dollars in losses to United States citizens and so many hundreds of millions additional to foreign investors. Therefore, if President Roosevelt's action was just in the case of Panama how much more so would President Wilson's firm intervention be in the case of Mexico where conditions are worse than any condition that ever existed in Colombia or even Bulgaria.

The American public knows very little of the intensely bitter feeling that existed in Colombia at the time the Hay-Herran Treaty passed the House and Senate at Washington. When this news arrived in Colombia acts of violence were committed against Americans throughout the Colombian Republic. Among the prominent persons attacked were Capt. T. T. Lovelace, the American commander

of the Colombian Navy, and Alban G. Snyder, Consul General of the United States. At this time the coat-of-arms of the United States at the consulate at Cartagena was desecrated in the most revolting manner, and Capt. Lovelace cabled the facts to the State Department at Washington. Admiral Sigsbee on the *Olympia* was sent to Cartagena to demand a public apology from the governor, who promptly made it.

Following this incident, Capt. Lovelace, then acting United States consul at Barranquilla, was sent to Bogota as special messenger with the Hay-Herran Treaty. Threats had been made on the coast and in the interior against any person who attempted to deliver the treaty to Mr. Beaupre, the American Minister at Bogota. Capt. Lovelace delivered the treaty and one week later Mr. Alban G. Snyder, the newly appointed consul general to Colombia, was due to arrive. The foreign ministers, realizing the strained relations between the United States and Colombia, in order to prevent any demonstration on Mr. Snyder's arrival, met at the Hotel Metropolitan. Capt. Lovelace was requested to meet Mr. Snyder at the station and escort him to the hotel. Capt. Lovelace approached Mr. Snyder on alighting from the train and requested him to take a street car instead of a carriage, in order to foil any attempt upon his life; but unfortunately, Mr. Snyder's military bearing and American appearance subjected him to scrutiny, and while in the car a vicious attack was made on him. An Antiochian colonel raised a heavy cane and struck at Mr. Snyder's head when Lovelace knocked the colonel off the car. A riot then ensued and the fight continued to the hotel, the mob breaking through the heavy doors. The foreign ministers tried in vain to stop the riot and it was not until soldiers arrived that order was restored.

After this the Hay-Herran treaty was considered and rejected by the Colombian Senate and the \$10,000,000 offered by the United States to Colombia for the Canal concession was simultaneously refused. Panama seceded and received the money plus \$250,000 a year.

The bitter feeling then existing in Colombia toward Americans is shown by the following incidents: The governor of Magdalena, General Juan B. Tova, asked the protection of the United States Consulate. The Colombian mob, at Barranquilla, sought to kill him for his failure to subdue the Panama revolutionists. With tears he told Capt. Lovelace, then United States vice-consul there, that "Panama had passed." Despite danger to his life the old general declined to enter the consulate until the United States flag on the office wall was placed in the safe out of his sight. The vice-consul in consideration of the Colombian's feelings placed it there and the report of the incident is of record in the State Department at Washington.

It is not generally known how the Panamanian gunboat "Oriente," having a speed of 23.4 knots an hour, was purchased from the Nixons about the time of Panama's secession, or of the events preceding its purchase. The interesting telegram in this connection received at the Imperial Hotel, New York, in part said: ". . . procure 'one' big and fast enough to lick the gunboat (Colombian) 'Cartagena' . . . ," would make history.

The same man, Capt. T. T. Lovelace, who delivered the Hay-Herran treaty to United States Minister Beaupre at Bogota and who was United States vice consul at Baranquilla, was appointed the first captain of the "Oriente." At the termination of his command his sealed orders, "not to be opened unless you lose your ship," were collected from him at Colon by an American civilian

who said he was from Washington, and who produced the duplicate of the series and number inscribed on the "sealed orders." Of course they would not have been surrendered if sufficient proof of authority had not been forthcoming.

Some time before this a torpedo boat destroyer, with four funnels, sans flag, sans number, sans nationality, was lying not far from Colon. Someone has said the sealed orders referred to the idle destroyer. "Anyway," as politicians have it, it is believed that the destroyer was subsequently broken up at the Norfolk Navy Yard. During Panama's rebellion against Colombia, the United States gunboat "Helena" was conveniently near Aspinwall. During all this intrigue and since the United States apparently overlooked a most important matter in another part of Colombia.

Until the State of Panama was severed from the Colombian union, Colombia possessed two Pacific coast ports, Panama and Buenaventura. The latter as a Pacific exit for the commerce of the interior is more important and Colombia still retains it. As a coaling station it is most important and is only some three hundred miles southeast of Panama.

Lord Murray left London about the middle of 1913 for Bogota. Lord Cowdray, his associate, was interested in Colombian oil and other projects in that Republic. Wide concessions were granted to Lords Murray and Cowdray by the Colombian government, and rumors were current that these were not to the liking of the Washington administration. Reports had it that these concessions were subsequently nullified, much to the satisfaction of the United States, and Lord Murray returned to London. Simultaneously with his withdrawal from Colombia, Mr. C. N. Breitung, a New York financier, left for Colombia



following in Lord Murray's footsteps. As Mr. Breitung and Lord Cowdray have business relations, many persons have said that he "picked up the trail" where Lord Murray temporarily abandoned it, thus forming a pivot of interests masking the British position.

Was oil the only motive of Lord Murray's journey from London to Bogota, or was the prime motive to arrange and procure the contracts for the acquisition of the Ferro-Carril-del-Cauca and the Port of Buenaventura?

The Cauca railroad has its terminal at Buenaventura and is built across the western Cordillera to the Cauca Valley, that Eden in the Andes. The extension of this line north from Cali through Buga to connect with Sir Rivers Wilson's Colombian Atlantic railroad system will complete the all-British transcontinental Colombian route, and will be of tremendous commercial and strategic importance; which taken together with Lord Cowdray's Inter-Oceanic Tehautepec railroad effectually flanks the Panama Canal in Tehautepec to the Northwest and the Colombian Trans-continental to the southeast.

As a coaling station for Great Britain, Buenaventura is most convenient and renders British vessels entirely independent of the Panama coal storage at the islands of Nace and Flamingo in Panama Bay. Especially is it a convenient port since the vast coal deposits on the line of railroad in the vicinity of Cali are less than eighty miles from Buenaventura and are the only known coal deposits between the Canadian frontier and Valparaiso on the Pacific Coast.

Is it possible that President Wilson had all this in mind when he said in his speech to Congress asking for the repeal of the Panama Canal Act of 1912: "I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater



delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in an ungrudging measure."

If the United States prohibits Japan's private corporations from colonizing Magdalena Bay in Mexico, perhaps for similar reasons it will employ the Monroe Doctrine to prohibit Great Britain's private corporations from obtaining the most valuable harbor and coaling station on the Pacific Coast, only one day's steam from Panama.

If Lord Cowdray "lets go" the Colombian concessions granted to Lord Murray, it would be interesting to know as a matter of curiosity, how much of the \$25,000,000 that the United States is about to pay to Colombia, will be turned over to Lord Cowdray for his surrender.

An annual report of Rear Admiral Bradford, chief of the Equipment Bureau of the United States Navy, says that he spent in one year \$2,273,111 for coal. Thousands of tons of Welsh and Australian coal are annually imported to San Francisco for the United States Navy. The figures available show 105,066 tons of foreign coal in the year of his report and 9000 tons of domestic coal from the Atlantic seaboard at a cost of \$9.25 per ton in each instance. Apart from this the Pacific Coast ports use nearly 250,000 tons of foreign coal per annum which sells for \$15 U. S. C. per ton alongside. Coal can be placed alongside at Buenaventura for less than \$2.50 per ton, and the British control it and the port.

In a speech just before the last Balkan war, the present British King said to his people: "*Wake up England.*" Those words embodied the most cogent command he has ever uttered as a constitutional monarch. Those three words will be handed down in the history of his country. He felt their necessitous import. He expressed all he felt in them. If some great man could say, "United States, wake up," or "Stop drifting," and have those

words received by the people in the same spirit as were those of the British King, the United States might be in time to prepare for that which is inevitably descending upon it with "glacier like certainty of advance."

The plane of State, military, and social conditions, in the United States, is the antithesis of a national metamorphosis. The population has become metamorphic, and being so, lacks concentration of political purpose, which is due to immigration and a great alien population. An artificiality in the pose of patriotism is present, noisy in its demonstration and not entirely sincere in all its protestations, lacking that sense of pride in ancestral lore which is inherent in nations of unmixed strain.

The nation is becoming chrysophilic in character and its military efficiency and strength is a long way in the rear of world powers. This is not realized and consequently not admitted by the people, or cared about by their representatives in Congress. All rely on the mobilization of that force so strongly condemned by General Washington in his day, and classed as a "discard" by General Chaffee in this day.

This condition is due to the altered sociological situation in its relation to the necessities of obtaining and maintaining an effective army.

If one world power to-day allied itself to the cause of General Huerta, or raised the question of Pacific expansion by the United States, and America was left without outside allies to fight it out, the position would result in one of humiliation, due to unpreparedness in war.

## CHAPTER VI.

## MONROE DOCTRINE AND EXPANSION.

In 1862 Mr. Seward declared: "The United States have neither the right nor the disposition to intervene by force on either side in the lamentable war which is going on between France and Mexico."

In 1823 Monroe sent his message to Congress in which he said:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those Powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to *extend their system* to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European Power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintain it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European Power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

During 90 years the interpretation of those sentences has become elastic to the detriment of all foreign powers and beneficial to the United States. "*To extend their system*" may be construed as relative to the Holy Alliance formed by the Continental Courts after the overthrow of Napoleon for the repression of revolutionary movements in their kingdoms.

Canning asserted the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of foreign states in 1822, a principle he enforced in 1826 by sending troops to Portugal to defend it against Spain, while recognizing the revolted colonies of South America and Mexico.

Through Canning Great Britain broke from that "Holy pact," and was probably a party and privy to Monroe's message. The doctrine has grown disproportionate to its original intent. It has been used selfishly, stretched and distorted in order to serve convenient purposes at different moments. The elasticity of its limitations was determined and clearly demonstrated in the Venezuela boundary question.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Olney) undertook to interpret the Monroe Doctrine. His construction was:

"The United States is practically sovereign on this *continent* and its fiat law."

Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister, replied to this interpretation with a touch of amusing sarcasm:

"The Monroe Doctrine must always be mentioned with respect on account of the distinguished statesman to whom it is due."

The possibility of George Canning being in his mind at the time was lost sight of in the United States.

The distortion of its literal purport has covered the despotic acquisition, by the United States, of California, a naval station in Cuba, Puerto Rico and Panama, and it has encroached on the rights of Mexico in deciding how Mexico, not Europe, shall not colonize its own Lower California.

In his message, Monroe declared against "Oppression." The dictatorial attitude of the United States, in the latter instance, was an act of oppression and contrary to that

doctrine advocated by Monroe. So also was the instigated seizure of Panama.

Mr. Cleveland's foreign policy in relation to Venezuela was as undiplomatic as it was unnecessary. His message to Great Britain was couched in language which might have readily culminated in unpleasant relations, had that country not received it temperately, diplomatically and in a spirit of conciliatory toleration. The message was like an unexpected blow in the face from a friend, to the British Government and public.

The touchy moods of the "American" State Departments were again exemplified in the case of the demand by the United States Government for the recall of Lord Sackville West during the same administration. He had been duped into a written expression of opinion as to the relative merits of the Presidential candidates, and suggested how the writer should vote. The opinion was written privately to a former British subject who at the time was a United States citizen. There was a possibility that the correspondence was preconceived by persons who desired the result it subsequently achieved.

Moods and personal whims are not within the province of officials of state, especially of those of a republican government.

#### EXPANSION.

The United States has taken upon itself to *preserve* Latin America for *itself* from Europe and Asia, and Latin America is silent. It is suspicious and with good reason, for in 17 years, Panama, Guantanamo and Puerto Rico, in the Atlantic, have been annexed, and but for the Platt Amendment the United States might have been in possession of all of Cuba.

## Expansion in the Pacific—Hawaiian Islands:

	Area (sq. miles)	Population
Hawaii .....	4,210	55,382
Maui .....	728	28,623
Kahoolawe .....	69	27
Lanai .....	139	131
Molokai .....	161	1,791
Oahu .....	600	81,993
Kauai .....	547	23,744
Niihau .....	97	208
	<hr/> 6,651	<hr/> 191,909

Guam, the largest of the Ladrone Islands, area 207 square miles, population 12,000, naval base Samoa, consists of the island of Tutuila and Anua, Ofu, Olosenga, Tau, and Rose Islands, with a total area of about 95 square miles and a population estimated at 6,000 in 1910. The flag of the United States was hoisted on Wake Island in 1899 and other islands in the Pacific have been annexed from time to time, including Johnston, Callego, Starbuck, Penrhyn, Palmyra, Washington, Fanning, and Christmas, Howland and Baker, Gardner, Medway, Marcus, and Morell, and the Philippine Islands—

Island:	Area (sq. miles)	Population 1913
Bohol .....	1,441	243,148
Cebri .....	1,762	592,247
Leyte .....	2,722	357,641
Luzon .....	40,969	3,798,507
Mesbate .....	1,236	.....
Mindanao .....	36,292	499,634
Mindoro .....	3,851	.....
Negros .....	4,881	460,776



Palawau .....	4,027	.....
Panay .....	4,611	743,646
Samar .....	5,031	222,690
Other Islands (3,130).....	14,572	.....
<hr/>		<hr/>
Total .....	121,395	7,635,426

So it would appear that the United States feels itself at liberty to expand anywhere while prohibiting like expansion to foreign powers, European or Asiatic.

The current interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States is not quite clear and may be open to grave question by the powers at some future date. They are beginning to look upon the exercise of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States as one of singular opportunism.

## CHAPTER VII.

The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty between the United States and Great Britain, of *April 19th*, 1850, provided that no fortifications shall be established in Central America. This is contained in the following provision which is one of the articles of the treaty:

"The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume, or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America."

This treaty was abrogated in 1900 and a draft of the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty substituted. Article VII. contained:

"No fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder."

This treaty was not ratified by the United States Senate, but the second or following treaty was executed.

As will be seen in the treaty the question of fortifications remains especially ambiguous and open to argument. It only allows the United States to protect the canal against lawlessness.

## HAY-PAUNCEFOTE TREATY

BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN,  
TO FACILITATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SHIP CANAL.

Signed at Washington, November 18, 1901. Ratified by Great Britain, January 20, 1902. Ratification advised by the Senate, December 16, 1901. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, February 21, 1902. Ratified by the President, December 26, 1901.

Proclaimed, February 22, 1902,

“BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

## “A PROCLAMATION.

“Whereas, a Convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, *by whatever route may be considered expedient*, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the Convention of the 19th April, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, *without impairing the ‘general principle’ of neutralization established in Article VIII. of that Convention*, was concluded and signed by their respective plenipotentiaries at the city of Washington on the 18th day of November, 1901, the original of that Convention is word for word as follows:

## “TREATY.

“THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and HIS MAJESTY EDWARD THE SEVENTH, of the UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, KING, AND EMPEROR OF INDIA, being desirous to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, by whatever route may be considered expedient, and to that

end to remove any objection which may arise out of the Convention of the 19th April, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, *without impairing the 'general principle' of neutralization established in Article VIII. of that Convention*, have for that purpose *appointed as their Plenipotentiaries*:

"THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States of America;

"AND HIS MAJESTY EDWARD THE SEVENTH, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King and Emperor of India, the Right Honourable Lord Pauncefote, C.C.B., C.C.M.C., His Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States;

"Who, having communicated to each other their full powers which were *found to be in due and proper form*, have agreed upon the following Articles:

"ARTICLE I. The High Contracting Parties agree that the present Treaty shall supersede the afore-mentioned Convention of the 19th April, 1850.

"ARTICLE II. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States, either directly at its own cost, or by gift or *loan of money to individuals or Corporations*, or through subscription to or *purchase of stock or shares*, and that *subject to the provisions of the present Treaty*, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

"ARTICLE III. The United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralization of such ship canal, the following

Rules, *substantially as embodied in the Convention of Constantinople, signed the 28th October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal, that is to say:*

1. The canal shall be free and open to the *vessels of commerce and of war* of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that *there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise.* Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

\*“2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to *maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.*

“3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary, and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay in accordance with the Regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.

“Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same Rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

“4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike material, on the canal, except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

---

\*Since this treaty was ratified the Canal entrances have been fortified and the heaviest artillery armaments in the world emplaced by the United States.



"5. The provisions of this Article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within 3 marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than twenty-four hours at any one time, except in case of distress, and in such case, shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within twenty-four hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

"6. The plant, establishment, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof, for the purpose of this Treaty, and in time of war, as in time of peace, shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents, and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

ARTICLE IV. It is agreed that no change of territorial sovereignty or of the international relations of the country or countries transversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principle of neutralization or the obligation of the High Contracting Parties under the present Treaty.

"ARTICLE V. The present Treaty shall be ratified by the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, by and with the *advice and consent* of the *Senate thereof*, and by His BRITANNIC MAJESTY; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or at London at the earliest possible time within six months from the date hereof.

"In faith whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty and thereunto affixed their seals.

"Done in duplicate at Washington, the 18th day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and one.

"JOHN HAY. (Seal)

"PAUNCEFOTE. (Seal)



"And whereas the said Convention has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratification of the two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington on the twenty-first day of February, one thousand nine hundred and two:

"Now, therefore, be it known that I, THEODORE ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, have caused the said Convention to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and *fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.*

"In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed. 1

"Done in the city of Washington, this twenty-second day of February, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and two, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-sixth.

(Seal)

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

"By the President:

"JOHN HAY,

"Secretary of State."

The United States did not acquire, by the Isthmian Canal Convention of NOVEMBER 18, 1903, any title to territory in the Republic of Panama, but merely a perpetual right of occupation, use, and control of and over a zone of land ten miles in width. For this privilege it paid to the Republic of Panama the sum of \$10,000,000, and undertook to pay the sum of \$250,000 annually so long as such occupancy continued, such payments beginning on February 26, 1913.

## CHAPTER VIII.

ACQUISITION OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE IN  
1904 FROM PANAMA.

Article 2 of the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama, ratified by the United States Senate, February 23, 1904. Treaty in effect February 26, 1904, provided for the cession in perpetuity by Panama of a strip of territory adjacent to the canal, as follows:

"The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity, the use, occupation and control of the zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of said canal of the width of ten miles, extending to the distance of five miles on each side of the center line of the route of the canal to be constructed. The said zone beginning in the Caribbean Sea; three marine miles from mean low water mark and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to a distance of three marine miles from mean low water mark, with *the proviso that the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent to said cities, which are included within the boundaries of said zone above described SHALL NOT be included within this grant.* The Republic of Panama further grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above described, which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the said canal or of any auxiliary canals or other work necessary and con-

venient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of said enterprise. The Republic of Panama further grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of all islands within the limits of the zone above described, and in addition thereto, the group of small islands in the bay of Panama named Perico, Nace, Culebra and Flamingo."

#### THE PANAMA CANAL ACT OF 1912.

Provision for the Permanent Government of the Canal Zone and Exemption of Coastwise Vessels from Tolls.

Deemed to be in Contravention with the Treaty of 1901, The Sixty-second Congress, Second Session, passed "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection and operation of the Panama Canal and for the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," which was approved August 24, 1912, and is as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the zone of land and land under water of the width of ten miles extending to the distance of five miles on each side of the centre line of the route of the canal now being constructed thereon, which zone begins in the Caribbean Sea three marine miles from mean low-water mark and extends to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to the distance of three marine miles from mean low-water mark, *excluding therefrom the cities of Panama and Colon and their adjacent harbors located within said zone*, as excepted in the treaty with the Republic of Panama dated November 18, 1903, but including all islands within said described zone, and in addition thereto the group of islands in the Bay of Panama named Perico, Nace, Culebra and Flamingo, and any lands and waters outside of said limits above de-

scribed which are necessary or convenient or from time to time may become necessary or convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of the said canal or of any auxiliary canals, lakes, or other works necessary or convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of said canal, the use, occupancy, or control whereof were granted to the United States by the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama, the ratifications of which were exchanged February 26, 1904, shall be known and designated as the Canal Zone, and the canal now being constructed thereon shall hereafter be known and designated as the Panama Canal. The President is authorized, by treaty with the Republic of Panama, to acquire any additional land or land under water not already granted, or which was excepted from the grant, that he may deem necessary for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, or protection of the Panama Canal, and to exchange any land or land under water not deemed necessary for such purposes for other land or land under water which may be deemed necessary for such purposes, which additional land or land under water so acquired shall become part of the Canal Zone.

“Sec. 2. That all laws, orders, regulations, and ordinances adopted and promulgated in the Canal Zone by order of the President for the government and sanitation of the Canal Zone and the construction of the Panama Canal are hereby ratified as valid and binding until Congress shall otherwise provide. The existing courts established in the Canal Zone by Executive order are recognized and confirmed to continue in operation until the courts provided for in this act shall be established.

“Sec. 3. That the President is authorized to declare by Executive order that all land and land under water

within the limits of the Canal Zone is necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of the Panama Canal, and to extinguish by agreement when advisable, all claims and titles of adverse claimants and occupants. Upon failure to secure by agreement title to any such parcel of land or land under water the adverse claim or occupancy shall be disposed of and title thereto secured in the United States and compensation therefor fixed and paid in the manner provided in the aforesaid treaty with the Republic of Panama, or such modification of such treaty as may hereafter be made.

#### A PERMANENT GOVERNMENT FOR THE CANAL ZONE.

"Sec. 4. That when in the judgment of the President the construction of the Panama Canal shall be sufficiently advanced toward completion to render the further services of Isthmian Canal Commission unnecessary the President is authorized by Executive order to discontinue the Isthmian Canal Commission, which, together with the present organization, shall then cease to exist; and the President is authorized thereafter to complete, govern, and operate the Panama Canal and govern the Canal Zone or cause them to be completed, governed and operated, through a Governor of the Panama Canal and such other persons as he may deem competent to discharge the various duties connected with the completion, care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, government, and protection of the canal and Canal Zone. If any of the persons appointed or employed as aforesaid shall be persons in the military or naval service of the United States, the amount of the official salary paid to any such person shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by or which shall be fixed under the terms of this act. The Governor of the Panama Canal shall be



appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, commissioned for a term of four years, and until his successor shall be appointed and qualified. He shall receive a salary of ten thousand dollars a year. All other persons necessary for the completion, care, management, maintenance, sanitation, government, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone shall be appointed by the President, or by his authority, removable at his pleasure and the compensation of such persons shall be fixed by the President, or by his authority, until such time as Congress may by law regulate the same, but the salaries or compensation fixed hereunder by the President shall in no instance exceed by more than twenty-five per centum the salary or compensation paid for the same or similar services to persons employed by the Government in Continental United States. That upon the completion of the Panama Canal the President shall cause the same to be officially and formally opened for use and operation.

"Before the completion of the canal, the Commission of Arts may make report to the President of their recommendation regarding the artistic character of the structure of the canal, such report to be transmitted to Congress.

#### NO TOLLS ON AMERICAN COASTWISE VESSELS.

"Sec. 5. That the President is hereby authorized to prescribe and from time to time to change the tolls that shall be levied by the Government of the United States for the use of the Panama Canal: Provided, That no tolls, when prescribed as above, shall be changed, unless six months' notice thereof shall have been given by the President by proclamation. *No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States.*



That section forty-one hundred and thirty-two of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 4132. Vessels built within the United States and belonging wholly to citizens thereof, and vessels which may be captured in war by citizens of the United States and lawfully condemned as prize, or which may be adjudged to be forfeited for a breach of the laws of the United States; and seagoing vessels, whether steam or sail, which have been certified by the Steamboat Inspection Service as safe to carry dry and perishable cargo, not more than five years old at the time they apply for registry, wherever built, which are to engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila, being wholly owned by citizens of the United States or corporations organized and chartered under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, the president and managing directors of which shall be citizens of the United States, or corporations organized and chartered under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, the president and managing directors of which shall be citizens of the United States, and no others, may be registered as directed in this title. Foreign-built vessels registered pursuant to this act shall not engage in the coastwise trade: Provided, That a foreign-built yacht, pleasure boat, or vessel not used or intended to be used for trade admitted to American registry pursuant to this section shall not be exempt from the collection of ad valorem duty provided in section thirty-seven of the act approved August 5, 1909, entitled “An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes:” That all materials of foreign production which may be necessary for the construction or repair of vessels built in the United States and all such materials neces-

sary for the building or repair of their machinery and all articles necessary for their outfit and equipment may be imported into the United States free of duty under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: Provided further, That such vessels so admitted under the provisions of this section may contract with the Postmaster-General under the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce," so long as such vessels shall in all respects comply with the provisions and requirements of said act.'

"Tolls may be based upon gross or net registered tonnage, displacement tonnage, or otherwise, and may be based on one form of tonnage for warships and another for ships of commerce. The rate of tolls may be lower upon vessels in ballast than upon vessels carrying passengers or cargo. When based upon net registered tonnage for ships of commerce the tolls shall not exceed one dollar and twenty-five cents per net registered ton, nor be less, other than for vessels of the United States and its citizens, than the estimated proportionate cost of the actual maintenance and operation of the canal, subject, however, to the provisions of article nineteen of the convention between the United States and the Republic of Panama, entered into November 18, 1903. If the tolls shall not be based upon net registered tonnage, they shall not exceed the equivalent of one dollar and twenty-five cents per net registered ton as nearly as the same may be determined, nor be less than the equivalent of seventy-five cents per net registered ton. The toll for each passenger shall not be more than one dollar and fifty cents. The President is authorized to make and from time to time amend regulations governing the operation of the Panama Canal, and the passage and control of vessels

through the same or any part thereof, including the locks and approaches thereto, and all rules and regulations affecting pilots and pilotage in the canal or the approaches thereto through the adjacent waters.

“Such regulations shall provide for prompt adjustment by agreement and immediate payment of claims for damages which may arise from injury to vessels, cargo, or passengers from the passing of vessels through the locks under the control of those operating them under such rules and regulations. In case of disagreement suit may be brought in the district court of the Canal Zone against the Governor of the Panama Canal. The hearing and disposition of such cases shall be expedited and the judgment shall be immediately paid out of any moneys appropriated or allotted for canal operation.”

The remainder of the section provides for the method of adjusting all claims arising out of injuries to employes.

Section 6 provides for radio-communication at suitable places along the Panama Canal and adjacent coasts and for the establishment and maintenance of dry docks, repair shops, warehouses, etc., for the use of the vessels using the canal.

## CHAPTER IX.

## DUTIES OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

“Sec. 7. That the Governor of the Panama Canal shall, in connection with the operation of such canal, have official control and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and shall perform all duties in connection with the civil government of the Canal Zone, which is to be held, treated and governed as an adjunct of such Panama Canal. Unless in this act otherwise provided, all existing laws of the Canal Zone referring to the civil Governor or the civil administration of the Canal Zone shall be applicable to the Governor of the Panama Canal, who shall perform all such executive and administrative duties required by existing law. The President is authorized to determine or cause to be determined what towns shall exist in the Canal Zone and subdivide and from time to time resubdivide said Canal Zone into subdivisions, to be designated by name or number, so that there shall be situated one town in each subdivision, and the boundaries of each subdivision shall be clearly defined. In each town there shall be a magistrate’s court with exclusive original jurisdiction coextensive with the subdivision in which it is situated of all civil cases in which the principal sum claimed does not exceed three hundred dollars, and all criminal cases wherein the punishment that may be imposed does not exceed a fine of one hundred dollars, or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days, or both, and all violations of police regulations and ordinances and all actions involving possession or title to personal property or the forcible entry and detainer or real estate. Such magistrate shall

also hold preliminary investigations in charges of felony and offences under section ten of this act, and commit or bail in bailable cases to the district court. A sufficient number of magistrates and constables, who must be citizens of the United States, to conduct the business of such courts, shall be appointed by the Governor of the Panama Canal for terms of four years and until their successors are appointed and qualified, and the compensation of such persons shall be fixed by the President, or by his authority, until such time as Congress may by law regulate the same. The rules governing said courts and prescribing the duties of said magistrates and constables, oaths and bonds, the times and places of holding such courts, the disposition of fines, costs, forfeitures, enforcements of judgments, providing for appeals therefrom to the district court, and the disposition, treatment and pardon of convicts shall be established by order of the President. The Governor of the Panama Canal shall appoint all notaries public, prescribe their powers and duties, their official seal, and the fees to be charged and collected by them."

Sections 8, 9 and 10 provide for a judiciary for the Canal Zone, and prescribe its duties, and Section 11 provides for jurisdiction by the Interstate Commerce Commission in matters of competition by common carriers through the canals involving disputes as to the facts. The remaining sections of the act are as follows:

#### EXTRADITION.

"Sec. 12. That all laws and treaties relating to the extradition of persons accused of crime in force in the United States, to the extent that they may not be in conflict with or superseded by any special treaty entered into between the United States and in the Republic of Panama with respect to the Canal Zone, and all laws relating to

the rendition of fugitives from justice as between the several States and Territories of the United States, shall extend to and be considered in force in the Canal Zone, and for such purposes and such purposes only the Canal Zone shall be considered and treated as an organized Territory of the United States.

#### THE CANAL IN TIME OF WAR.

"Sec. 13. That in time of war in which the United States shall be engaged, or when, in the opinion of the President, war is imminent, such officer of the army as the President may designate shall, upon the order of the President, assume and have exclusive authority and jurisdiction over the operation of the Panama Canal and all of its adjuncts, appendants, and appurtenances, including the entire control and government of the Canal Zone, and during a continuance of such condition the Governor of the Panama Canal shall, in all respects and particulars as to the operation of such Panama Canal, and all duties, matters, and transactions affecting the Canal Zone, be subject to the order and direction of such officer of the army.

"Sec. 14. That this act shall be known as, and referred to as, the Panama Canal act, and the *right to alter, amend, or repeal any* or all of its provisions or to extend, modify or annul any rule or regulation made under its *authority is expressly reserved.*

#### FORTIFICATION OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

Chapter 285 of the Statutes of the Sixty-first Congress, third session, "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, contained the following appropriations for the fortification of the Isthmian Canal:



"For construction of sea coast batteries on the Canal Zone, two million dollars;

"For the purchase, manufacture and test of sea coast cannon for coast defence, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments and machinery necessary for the manufacture at the arsenals (to cost ultimately not to exceed one million, nine hundred and six thousand dollars), one million dollars, the same to be immediately available and to continue available until expended."

Public Law No. 302, "An act making appropriations for Sundry Civil Expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, approved August 24, 1912, contained the following appropriations for the fortifications of the Isthmian Canal:

"For the following for fortifications and armament thereof for the Isthmian Canal, to be immediately available and to continue available until expended, namely:

"CAUSEWAY. For the construction of a causeway or bridge for use in connection with fortifications, \$150,000.

"SEACOAST BATTERIES. For construction of seacoast batteries on the Canal Zone, \$1,000,000 and any balance of the appropriation for the construction of seacoast batteries on the Canal Zone made by the act of March 4, 1911.

"SUBMARINE MINE STRUCTURES. For the construction of mining casements, cable galleries, torpedo storehouses, cable tanks and other structures necessary for the operation, preservation and care of submarine mines and their accessories on the Canal Zone, \$220,000.

"FIELD FORTIFICATIONS AND CAMPS. For the construction of field fortifications and the preparation of camp sites on the Canal Zone, \$200,000.

"ARMAMENT OF FORTIFICATIONS. For the purchase, manufacture and test of seacoast cannon for coast de-

fence, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments and the machinery necessary for the manufacture at the arsenals (to cost ultimately not to exceed \$2,324,000), \$500,000.

"For the purchase, manufacture and test of ammunition for seacoast cannon, including the necessary experiments in connection therewith, and the machinery necessary for its manufacture at the arsenals, \$575,000.

"SUBMARINE MINES. For the purchase of submarine mines and the necessary appliances to operate them *for closing the channels leading to the Isthmian Canal*, \$111,750.

"In all, specifically for fortifications and armaments thereof for the Isthmian Canal, \$2,806,950.

"For the fortifications and armament of the Panama Canal, to be immediately available and to continue available until expended, namely:

"SURVEYS. For detailed surveys of the areas of the Canal Zone required for military purposes, including the cost of marking permanently the boundaries of such areas, \$12,000.

"PURCHASE OF LAND. For the purchase of land on the Canal Zone, required for military purposes, \$50,000.

"SEACOAST BATTERIES. For the construction of seacoast batteries on the Canal Zone, \$2,365,000.

"ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER PLANTS. For the purchase and installation of electric light and power plants for the seacoast fortifications on the Canal Zone, \$173,000.

"SEARCHLIGHTS. For the purchase and installation of searchlights for the seacoast fortifications on the Canal Zone, \$285,000.

"SANITARY CLEARING. For sanitary clearing, filling

and drainage in vicinity of camps, posts and defensive works on the Canal Zone, as follows:

"Margarita Island: For filling swamp in rear defensive works, \$180,000; for clearing and improving permanent post site and drill ground at Miraflores, \$30,000.

"ARMAMENT OF FORTIFICATIONS. For the purchase, manufacture, and test of seacoast cannon for coast defence, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals (to cost ultimately not to exceed \$2,506,000), \$1,000,000; Provided, that the Chief of Ordinance is authorized to transfer to and use in the fortifications of the Panama Canal one sixteen inch gun and carriage, procured, or to be procured, out of appropriations heretofore made under armament of fortifications for Continental United States:

"For the purchase, manufacture and test of ammunition for seacoast cannon, including the necessary experiments in connection therewith, and the machinery necessary for its manufacture at the arsenals, \$575,000.

"FIRE CONTROL. For the construction of fire control stations and the purchase and installation of accessories therefor, \$200,000.

"In all specifically for fortifications and armaments thereof for the Panama Canal, \$4,870,000.

"The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to cause to be prepared and submit to Congress on or before December 15, 1913, complete plans for, and drafted estimates of, barracks and quarters for the *mobile army and sea coast artillery on the Canal Zone.*"

## CHAPTER X.

Obsessed by the internal dollar politics of political patronage in the gift of members of the United States Senate and even of the President himself; ambassadorial appointments to foreign nations, down to postmasterships to favorites, irrespective of qualification; the same system extending to each Governor of each State, State Senators and members of the State Legislatures, which include appointments to the judiciary, the whole country is at loggerheads every four years in attempts to obtain lucrative office, resulting in political upheaval and unrest. This covers the entire political area with intrusions of greed and discontent, culminating in scandalous accusations in the public press against the existing political power for the following four years, when the tirade of party abuse and the juggle of new appointments to Federal and State offices is re-enacted. New office holders equally as inefficient as their predecessors are then appointed by political preference and the internal struggle is again renewed, until the better element of the population eschew politics almost entirely and are at one in the thought, with Europeans, that constitutional monarchy of a democratic form is a more economical and preferable form of government.

In 1857 Macauley predicted the condition now existing. He said in respect to the United States:

"On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should

be permitted to drink champagne, and to ride in a carriage, while thousands of honest folks are in want of necessities. . . . When society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of the government with a strong hand or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman empire was in the fifth; with this difference that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

As a consequence of this internal chaos, few politicians are interested in foreign affairs, at least very few specialize or are educated in a school of diplomacy, or are familiar with the complexities attending the negotiation of foreign relations, or the importance of them. Upon appointment, the new incumbent of departmental office takes up the burden of unfinished treaties and negotiations left by his predecessor; often he is an opponent of the political party retired from power and so without specific training or sound knowledge of the subject, he and the committees (also politically appointed) wallow along in a quagmire of international errors, trusting to their natural acumen to adjust an issue.\*

In the United States the voice of the press is not always the voice of the people, but the acts of the people are generally dictated by the voice of the press, and it is feared and pandered to by Federal and State office hold-

---

\*As in the case of the Titanic inquiry for instance, the chairman's (Mr. Smith) knowledge of ships and navigation was so limited as to elicit international criticism.



ers alike, because it influences their destruction or creation individually and collectively.

How is it to be expected, under this system of political patronage, to maintain an efficient Department of State? One able to cope with the trained diplomats of Europe or Japan? United States ambassadors and ministers are appointed from the untrained masses; editors, attorneys, merchants, politicians and relatives of politicians; men whose families aspire to social heights *out* of the United States, whose desire it is to wander in the purlieus of royalty for a brief period. Diplomats! To the manner born and trained by early environments? No! At the termination of the short rule of the political party in power, they are recalled and substituted and the chrysalid diplomats having once fluttered, pass out of both official and public life. Foreign courts endure this and are in most cases relatively inappreciative. These embryo diplomatists, with few exceptions, comprise the representatives of the United States in Europe, Asia and South America, and mistakes follow. In other civilized countries young men are selected from great universities for diplomatic service, and carefully trained for the position; made proficient in modern languages; compelled to graduate from a College of Diplomacy to a third or fourth secretaryship of an inferior nation, and by efficiency, inviolate integrity and marked ability, after serving years in a like position in many minor embassies and legations, they ascend to first secretaryships of the embassies of more prominent countries before becoming ministers of legations to even third class powers. How can untrained men under the United States system, compete with such experience? They cannot and their efforts in many instances are smiled at indulgently.



## CHAPTER XI.

As a result of appointing untrained ambassadors and ministers, President Wilson delivered himself of the following remarkable speech before Congress at Washington on March 5, 1914, relative to the Panama Canal Treaty with England. Briefly the issue was: Should coastwise American ships have an advantage over British ships in canal tolls in the face of a treaty existing between the two countries to the effect that all vessels of all nations should pass through the Canal on terms of equality. The Panama Canal Act, passed by the United States Government in August, 1912, provided for an advantage, viz: exemption from the payment of tolls by American coastwise vessels in contravention of the then existing treaty made between Great Britain and the United States of America by Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador and John Hay, Secretary of State for the United States, in November, 1901.

President Wilson asked for the *repeal of the Panama Canal Act of 1912* and upheld the treaty. The bill for the repeal is known as the Sims Bill. The text of the President's speech was as follows:

"I have come to you on an errand which can be briefly performed, but I beg you will not measure its importance by the number of sentences in which I state it. *No communication that I have addressed to Congress has carried with it a more grave or far reaching implication to the interests of the country*, and I come now to speak upon a matter with regard to which I am charged, to a peculiar degree, by the Constitution itself, with personal responsibility.

"I come to ask the repeal of that provision of the Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in coastwise trade of America from the payment of tolls, and to urge upon you the justice and wisdom and large policy of such a repeal with the utmost earnestness of which I am capable. *In my own judgment, maturely formed after careful consideration, I believe that exemption constitutes a mistaken economic policy from every point of view, and is, moreover, in plain contravention of the treaty with Great Britain concerning the canal, concluded November 18, 1901.*

"But I have not come before you to urge my personal views. I come to *state to you a fact and a situation.* Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much debated measure, *its meaning is not debated outside of the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation,* and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal. *We consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate it,* and we are too big, too powerful and too self-respecting a nation to interpret with too strained or refined reading, the words of our promises, just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please. The large thing to do is the only thing *we can afford to do,* and that is a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood. We ought to reverse our action without raising the question of whether we are right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for sincere generosity and redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation.

"I ask this of you *in support of the foreign policy of my administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer conse-*

*quence, if you do not grant it to me in an ungrudging measure."*

This last sentence was generally considered significant. It was taken as a veiled reference to the President's acknowledged desire to accede to England's wishes relative to canal tolls as a means of insuring British support for the administration's course in other delicate involvements. Among the diplomats was Secretary of State Bryan, the German Ambassador Count Von Bernstorff, the French Ambassador (Mr. Jusserand). The British Ambassador, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, was absent.

*The Senators arrived late. It was 12:30 before they were announced.* Meanwhile President Wilson had been waiting in the speaker's room. As he finished, just at 12:39, there was an outburst of applause. Speaker Clark, the third officer of the United States Government, referred the message to the Commerce Committee.

Congressman Underwood, the *Democratic* floor leader, declined to comment on the address. He said he thought a party caucus concerning the President's request was unlikely, and plainly indicated that he *disagreed*.

Congressman Adamson of Georgia, chosen as the President's spokesman in the House debate on the canal tolls, was *emphatic in his approval* of the administration's attitude. "I was pleased with the message," he said, "because it is the 'square' thing at home and abroad. The charge that we are surrendering to England is a *lie*. We will now repeal that piece of *rascality*."\*

On March the 31st following, the Congress voted on the repeal of the Canal Act of 1912. The third officer of the United States Government, the Speaker of the House, Mr. Champ Clark, also a Democrat and of the same

---

\*Enacted during Mr. Taft's administration.

political party as the President, spoke as follows prior to the division:

"Mr. Speaker, there is no personal issue between the President of the United States and myself. I have at no time uttered one word of criticism of the President. At no time, so far as I believe, has the President said one word of criticism of me. In the nature of things, a man who is worthy to hold a high public post in the service of the country must believe that other public servants are actuated by the same high, courageous and patriotic motives by which he believes himself to be moved.

"I have never entertained the opinion that President Wilson is actuated by other than the highest patriotic motives. I do not believe that President Wilson has ever entertained any other opinion as to the conduct of those of us who find it necessary to differ from him on this question.

"President Wilson does not desire a breach in the Democratic party. I do not desire a breach in the Democratic party, and there is no breach in the Democratic party

"Some papers assert that I am opposing this surrender to Great Britain as an opening gun in my campaign for President in 1916. It may surprise these obsequious courtiers to know that I have never hinted to any human being that I would be a Presidential candidate in 1916, and that I am not a candidate.

*\*"It will surprise these limber-backed incense swingers still more to know what I had uniformly told those who have suggested my candidacy in 1916, and it is this: 'If President Wilson makes a success of his administration he will be renominated and elected in 1916; but if he*

---

\*Mr. Clark's slangy sentences are unique, but his parliamentary colloquialisms are doubtlessly appreciated and understood in some parts of the United States.

makes a failure, which God forbid, the nomination will not be worth having.'

"One more word on this head: I do not believe that the fact that I led on twenty-nine ballots at Baltimore, receiving a clear majority on nine, and that I got a majority of more than 300,000 over the President in primary elections where he and I competed, precludes me from discharging my duty of exercising my rights as a Representative in Congress and as Speaker of the House to stand up for America against Great Britain.

"The fact that I am making this fight for our platform may end my public career. \*There are many things *worse* than being defeated for Congress or for the Presidency, and *one of them is to repudiate the platform on which you are elected.*

"*I have no word of criticism for my Democratic friends who are going to vote for the repeal.* We have worked together too long; we have mourned together in defeat for sixteen years, but never were disheartened; we have rejoiced together in our victories during the last four years, and I hope we will have cause to rejoice in many more.

"I never spent as much time thinking about what my duty was as upon this. I looked at it from every conceivable angle to see if there was any justification for not keeping our platform pledge, but to save my life I could conjure no excuse for bolting the platform.

"On the 19th of August, 1893, I made my first speech in the House. On that occasion, as on this, a platform figured in the proceedings. Among other things, I said:

"'What is a platform anyway? Is it an honest declara-

---

\*Evidently Mr. Clark is of the opinion that a "platform" is infallible, but right or wrong it must be supported.



tion of principles which the framers honestly intend to enact into laws if they attain to power, or it is a dishonest device whereby to entrap the unwary voter? Is it a candid statement of the faith that is in us, or is it a bait to catch "gudgeons?" (votes?)

"Is it the plighted word of men of honor to accomplish certain things, or is it only "*good enough Morgan*" till after election?"

"I have stood by that declaration ever since, now almost twenty years. I stand by it now.

"To whom does the Panama Canal belong *anyway*? To the United States of America. We built it at the enormous cost of \$400,000,000. *We built it on American soil. We have fortified it*; we will control it. In order to get a chance to build it *we created a republic*.

"For whose benefit did we build it? Primarily for our own; secondarily for the world's benefit\*

"Why did we build it? In order to secure cheap water freight rates.

"Who fought the building of the canal for fifteen long, wearisome years? The transcontinental railroads.

"Who would be the chief beneficiaries of this repeal bill? The same transcontinental railroads—the Canadian Pacific and Tehuantepec National railway heading the list. To do a thing to enable them to hold up their old rates is altruistic generosity run mad, and an outrage on the American people. I refuse to endorse any such programme.

\*"The declaration in favor of free tolls for our coast-

---

\*Mr. Clark did not state that Mr. Roosevelt appreciated as its greatest importance the interoceanic facilities afforded the United States fleet.

\*Without consideration of the treaty with Great Britain.



wise trade was writ large in the Baltimore platform. It is in these words:

“‘We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

“‘We also favor legislation forbidding the use of the Panama Canal by ships owned or controlled by railroad carriers engaged in transportation competitive with the canal.’

“We went to the people on that platform containing the free tolls plank, headed by President Wilson himself, who all endorsed it. Standing upon it we appealed to the voters of the land for their support, and they, responding to our Macedonian cry for help, enabled us to sweep the land from sea to sea by amazing majorities in the electoral college. And not as is proposed that we reward their faith in us by repudiating one of the planks of that platform. I refuse absolutely to be a party to any such performance.

“We most earnestly desire peace with all nations; we will buy peace from none. In the memorable words of the immortal Pickney, ‘Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute.’

“We are asked to grant to Great Britain, whom we defied and defeated in our infancy and whom we defied again and defeated in our early youth in the war of 1812—properly called ‘our second war of independence’—concessions grounded in injustice and humiliating in character—claims for which concessions had been abandoned by Great Britain, until Senator Elihu Root made a speech upholding the contentions of that foreign power.

\*“*We want war with no nation, but rather than surren-*

---

\*In view of the Democratic administration’s tardiness in protecting foreign interests and lives in Mexico, this may be taken *cum grano salis*.

*der our complete sovereignty over every square foot of our globe-encircling domain we will cheerfully and courageously face the world in arms.*

"The amazing request of the President for the repeal, like the peace of God, passeth all understanding. If he has any reasons which are not utterly untenable and which impelled him to make the request, he has not vouchsafed them to us as a body, or, so far as I am informed, to any member of the House.

"In his message one reason assigned by the President was in these words:

" 'That exemption constitutes a mistaken economic policy from every point of view.'

"If it is a 'mistaken economic policy' now, was it not 'a mistaken economic policy' during the campaign of 1912 when we all, under the head of the President himself, endorsed it as part of the Democratic creed on which we appealed for votes? If so, why did the President endorse it then?

"But it is not 'a mistaken economic policy.' If so, is not our policy from the very beginning, of shutting all foreign ships out of our coastwise trade, a mistaken economic policy?' Do not our rules of charging foreign vessels for wharfage, dockage, pilotage, and so forth, while charging your own vessels no fees, or smaller fees, also constitute 'a mistaken economic policy' if the President is correct?

"In short, if he is correct, is there not anything we can do to give our own people an economic advantage whatsoever in the race for commercial supremacy 'a mistaken economic policy?'

"A second reason for the repeal assigned by President Wilson is that the exemption of our coastwise trade from payment of tolls is 'in plain contravention of the treaty

with Great Britain concerning the canal, concluded on November 18, 1901.'

"Of course, the President believes that or he would not have said it, *but he was mistaken*. If I believed that, I would vote for him, but I am as tender and jealous of my country's honor as he is, or as any other living man is.\*

#### OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

"In the case of Olsen vs. Smith, reported in the 195th U. S. volume 332, at page 334, a case involving the very point involved in the exemption section of the Panama Canal tolls law, Chief Justice White, then Mr. Justice White, delivered the opinion of the court in these words:

" 'Nor is there merit in the contention that, as the vessel in question was a British vessel coming from a foreign port, the state laws concerning pilotage are in conflict with a treaty between Great Britain and the United States providing that "no higher or other duties or charges shall be imposed in any port of the United States on British vessels, than those payable in the same ports by vessels of the United States." Neither the exemption of coastwise steam vessels from pilotage resulting from the law of the United States, nor any lawful exemption of coastwise vessels created by the State law, concerns vessels in the foreign trade, and therefore any such exemptions do not operate to produce a discrimination against British vessels engaged in foreign trade, and in favor of vessels of the United States in such trade.

---

\*Article III., Section 1, Hay-Pauncefote treaty, says: "The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations . . . on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no *discrimination* against *any nation* or its citizens or its subjects in respect to the *conditions* or *charges of traffic* or otherwise."

“‘In substance, the proposition but asserts that by the law of the United States steam vessels in the coastwise trade have been exempt from pilotage regulations, therefore there is no power to subject vessels in foreign trade to pilotage regulations, even although such regulations apply without discrimination to all vessels engaged in such foreign trade, whether domestic or foreign.’

“The court held that there could be no discrimination where there was no competition, and that as by the law of the United States only American vessels can engage in coastwise trade, it was no violation of the treaty if the regulations applied to all vessels in the foreign trade. The reasoning of the decision applies equally well to the present situation.

“In his very able minority report the member from California (J. R. Knowland) thus elucidates the decision:

“‘The remarkable similarity of the facts and conditions in the Olsen against Smith case and that under consideration is apparent. In that case, it was urged that a law of the United States granting an exemption in favor of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade, was in violation of a treaty. The exemption in that case was from pilotage charges; in the present case it is from toll charges. Certainly it cannot be contended that there is *any distinction* between the cases in that regard.’

“In that case the language of the treaty bound this country not to impose any higher duty or charges on British vessels than on vessels of the United States in the same ports. But under the local law British vessels were required to pay pilotage charges while American vessels were completely exempt from such charges. ‘A plain violation of the treaty,’ the majority would say, but in effect the Supreme Court said: ‘No; for what we do, or

omit to do, with regard to our coastwise trade is of no concern to any nation, for they cannot complain with regard to a traffic in which they have no interest. No regulation, exemption or privilege which we see fit to grant to our coastwise trade is a just subject of complaint, for it does not concern vessels engaged in the foreign trade.'

"Certainly the President has never read the Olsen against Smith decision by our court of last resort or he never would have concluded that the exemption of tolls on our coastwise trade was in plain contravention of our treaty with Great Britain.

"If we have entertained an engagement which forbids us to manage our own affairs, then we must abide by it, however foolish or unnecessary that engagement may have been. But have we? Here opinions, honest opinions, differ, not only American but British opinions.

"His Majesty's government is quite certain now that exemption of tolls on our coastwise traffic violates the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, but it was very far from certain when its accredited representatives wrote to our Secretary of State so late as July, 1912, that 'if the trade should be so regulated as to make it certain that only bona fide coastwise traffic which is reserved for United States vessels would be benefitted by this exemption; it *may be* that no objection could be taken.'

"So far as our own best judges are concerned, it is quite safe to say that with the exception of the learned senior Senator from New York (Mr. Elihu Root) and our former highly respected Ambassador, Mr. Choate, the weight of recognized legal opinion of the highest merit, from Mr. Olney, Mr. Taft, Mr. Knox and the present Chief Justice of the United States is a precisely similar case, is practically unanimous to the effect that neither legally in a broad sense nor technically in a nar-



row application, does this treaty forbid us to regulate the transportation of our own goods in our own ships through our own canal between our own ports.

"The President differs from the judgment of these and many other men of like understanding. *He is convinced that the statute*, as it now stands, *does contravene our solemn obligation*, and should therefore be repealed. So believing, he does the only thing that an honorable and conscientious head of the nation could do; he asks to reconsider your action in view of his conviction that we have violated a pledge.

"Whatever may be the difference of opinion respecting the merits of the case, I do President Wilson honor for his act. If I were in his place and believed as he believes, I should do as he has done.

"In addition to the Supreme Court decision as pointed out by Mr. Mann, the same view is held by two Presidents, by two Secretaries of State and by the House itself on three separate occasions.

"The plain, unvarnished truth of history is that from the beginning to the present hour, what we do about our domestic trade, which includes the coastwise trade, we have continued solely as our business *and that foreign nations have absolutely nothing to do with it.*

"*The repeal means the practical abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine\*, which we forced into the code of the international law, and which the American people will maintain at all hazards. This is the only proposition they ever agreed upon, and the reason they agreed upon it was that it was a genuine 'American' pronouncement, one to warm the cockles of the heart of every true 'American' betwixt two seas. It was the doctrine of self-de-*

---

\*Not recognized by Great Britain.



fense. *Touch that doctrine and the bristles of the American people rise instanter.* Those who assert that the Monroe Doctrine is dead, reckon without their host.

"Now may the God of our fathers who nerved 3,000,000 backwoods Americans to fling their gage of battle into the face of the mightiest monarch in the world, who guided the hand of Jefferson in writing the charter of liberty, who sustained Washington and his ragged and starving army amid the awful horrors of Valley Forge, and who gave them complete victory on the blood stained heights of Yorktown, may He lead members to vote so as to prevent this stupendous folly—this unspeakable humiliation of the American republic."

Three ballots were necessary to determine the issue. The first ballot came on Republican opposition party leader Mann's motion to have the engrossed bill presented to the House and read. This motion was for a delay, that members might have a chance to consider the arguments made for free tolls. The motion was beaten by a vote of 247 to 160. The eighty-seven majority against Mann's motion, considered dilatory by the Wilson leaders, showed the strength of the Wilson hand.

Again Mann tried to stem the tide with a motion to recommit the bill for amendment in committee. This was suggested by Speaker Clark, who urged that the whole matter of tolls be left open to the Government for two years.

On the roll call demanded by Mr. Mann, the Wilson forces showed a strength of 232 to 176, a majority of 56, that would brook no delay in the final settlement by the House of the question.

The result on division was in favor of repeal: 247 ayes and 161 nays, or a majority of 86 for President Wilson.

Contributing to this majority were twenty-seven Republicans whom Republican Leader Mann could not hold to his great plea for free tolls without regard to party. Fifty-two of the Democratic (Government) members came to the support of Speaker Clark, Floor Leader Underwood and the other great Democrats who fought to save free tolls.

The announcement of the vote at 7:16 o'clock was received in comparative silence.

One able writer, Mr. Alfred Henry Lewis, writing for the Hearst papers (Independent Democratic) which extend across the American continent, said the following day:

"Bunker Hill was declared a failure, Yorktown a mistake and this country relegated to its original position as a province of the British crown by a House majority of 86. England should now consider and doubtless will, what reward is due from her to the timid knee-bending Wilson.

"In the debate which preceded this *national disgrace*, the Champ Clark speech was the master effort. Whether or not it convinced Congress it will at least convince the country. Clear, strong, honest, full of courage, it was in mighty contrast to the canal message of Mr. Wilson, in which nothing stood out except *the Wilson timidity*. That was the worst thing about Mr. Wilson's canal utterance. Its one appeal was to cowardice, its one argument fear.

"We must give England her way, and though the way be wrong, we must pay for the canal those \$400,000,000; we must pay those annual \$30,000,000 required to maintain it. And then perforce we must tamely operate it in accordance with England's will and under England's dominating thumb. Why? Because—according to the hair-hung ghost-shaken Mr. Wilson—we are afraid of

England, afraid of Japan, afraid of Mexico, afraid of everybody.

"After so abject an utterance from its White House it needed such a speech as Speaker Clark's to restore the country's self respect."

Many thousands read and believe this kind of comment who never knew there was a treaty in existence or were ignorant of its substance.

The issue was not without its comedy. The constituents of an extreme western state sent the following telegram to one of its Congressional representatives who voted against the President.

"Have read your brilliant speech declaring your own and America's willingness to *fight the world*. In such a gigantic struggle your patriotic services will be needed, and we proffer our efforts to obtain for you a conspicuous position on the front of the firing line."

The chaotic condition of the existing Congress over the Panama question—the Democratic party divided against itself, the Republican party (the opposition) divided against itself; the third officer of the United States set against the President in policy on this question in an endeavor to wreck a treaty existing at the time he entered his present office, is the direct result of an inefficient State Department. Mr. Clark's endeavor to actually *decrease the revenues* which should accrue to the Government of the United States from the operation of the Canal, by advocating free tolls for certain ships, admittedly United States ships, is antagonistic to good finance, in that the \$400,000,000 cost, and annual up-keep, together with the interest to bondholders, has to be repaid to the people who advanced it: and these very payments by the coastwise ship traffic would be a large factor in liquidation to the people on the investment they have

made. Mr. Clark's arguments do not appear to be sound, financially or diplomatically, whatever they may be politically. His policy would result in the elimination of income derived from coastwise traffic which, proportionately, should be applicable to interest and the repayment of capital account to *all* the people, and secondly it involves the violation of a treaty.

## CHAPTER XII.

## MEXICO.

In 1881 Mr. William Ewart Gladstone surrendered to the Boers in South Africa after Majuba. The last South African war was the outcome of that surrender. It was a sanguinary and long drawn out campaign. The position the United States occupies in relation to Mexico is similar in some respects. It has not forcefully intervened to protect the lives or property of its people living in that Republic, nor in any respect has it caused prompt armed intervention to protect the lives or property of the subjects of foreign nations, although reprisals were in effect on April 21st from other causes. This peculiar interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine is not in accordance with the application of the theory of "Policing Latin America," and the result may be, that begotten of this policy, the United States will have to participate in conflicts sooner or later, much the same as England did in South Africa as a result of Mr. Gladstone's weak military policy. It is generally conceded that had he used a firm hand in 1881, the last war would have been unnecessary. A firm military policy in Mexico today will obviate more serious complications later.

The condition in Mexico for a year prior to and three years after the resignation of Porfirio Diaz was one of riotous bloodshed. The indiscriminate and unjustifiable slaughter of over three hundred unoffending and industrious Chinamen at Torreon by the Madero insurrectionists, was the most outrageous exhibition of blood-thirsti-

ness ever enacted in a Christian country, excepting only St. Bartholomew.

The children in Torreon played with the heads of the victims on the streets and pulled them about by the pig-tails. The Madero Government consented to a small indemnity to China.

The resignation of Diaz (1911) left Madero, who had been recognized by the United States as President despite the Chinese massacre, at the head of the Government. Assassination, insurrection and war were rife during his supremacy. At this time the Covadonga incident occurred: Two Germans, man and wife, were attacked by Maderistas. The wife was outraged by soldiers in the presence of her husband. She was then mutilated and broken beer bottles thrust into the amputated breasts. The husband was then killed. Photographs taken at the time, and now in possession of the American Press Association at New York, exhibit the shocking condition of the bodies of these foreign victims. The incident is well known at the German Foreign office, and copies of the photographs are said to be in the possession of a very important German personage.

An English ex-army officer, living at Tampico, who had expressed political opinions, was found decapitated near the banks of the Panuco River. The name of this officer is in possession of Colonel H. S. Fitzgerald, C. B., who had the matter brought to the attention of the House of Commons. But for the attention attracted to buzzards devouring the body, the murder would not have been discovered.

In addition to the above was the murder of Mr. MacKenzie and other Americans in Sonora during the Diaz administration. Mr. MacKenzie, a Yale graduate, was the partner of Mr. W. C. Potter, then a practicing min-



ing engineer of Chicago, and a son-in-law of the late Mr. Paul Morton, ex-Secretary of the United States Navy.

A condition of rapine and murder of Europeans, Asiatic and United States citizen residents, has been continuous in Mexico now for nearly four years, and the following is an authentic partial list of the atrocities committed:

1. Mrs. Anderson, daughter and neighbor boy, killed June 22, 1911, Chihuahua. Murderers arrested by assistance of Americans. Confessed, served six months in jail and released. Madero soldiers.

2. Mabel Richardson, *little girl, outraged*. Colonia Juarez. No attempt made to punish perpetrators.

3. James D. Harvey, killed, State of Chihuahua. March, 1912, and mutilated with a spade. Nothing done.

4. William Adams, killed July 2, 1912, with his daughter's arms around him, by Mexican officer. Nothing done.

5. Thomas Fountain, executed after courtmartial by Salazar, at Parral, after protest from the U. S. Government. Madero and others threatened by Mr. Taft. Nothing done. Salazar later arrested in the U. S. charged with smuggling and later released. Now being held at Fort Bliss. (Madero administration.)

6. Joshua Stevens, killed near Colonia Pacheco, Mexico, August 26, 1912, in defending his daughters from attack. The girls, one with a stick, the other with a shotgun, drove their assailants away.

7. John Brooks, Texan, killed at Colonia Chuchucpa, Chihuahua, in 1913. (Insurrectionists.)

8. Killing of Rogers Palmer, Englishman, because of failure to open safe at Durango about June 18, 1913. (Insurrectionists.)

9. Wounding of Carlos Van Brandis and L. W. Elder, Americans, about the same time, by explosion of bomb used to force door where foreigners had taken refuge. Foreigners compelled to pay ransom. (Insurrectionists.)

10. W. N. Steep, American, about the same time, shot on failure to pay 500 pesos. (Bandits.)

11. A. W. Lauriaut, English subject, stripped, beaten, shot and left for dead about the same time. (Bandits.)

12. Edmund Hayes, American, employe of Madera Company; also Robert Thomas, negro, killed at Madera by Mexican Federal officer, Santa Caraveo, and demand made by Secretary Bryan on Federals through embassy and Marion Letcher for arrest and punishment. Nothing done until September 11, when Senator Fall called attention of the State Department and President to the fact that this officer was in Juarez, five minutes ride from El Paso. On the telegram he was formally arrested and later discharged.

13. B. Stowe, shot in Chihuahua by rebels, 1912. Nothing done.

14. Benjamin Griffin, rancher, murdered July 5, 1913, near Chuichupa by bandits.

15. John H. Williams, mining engineer, killed by stray bullet March 8, 1913, when rebels attacked Nacozari.

16. Boris Gorow, consulting engineer, killed when an attack was made on Neuvo Buena Vista on February 11, 1913.

17. U. G. Wolf, mining engineer, murdered July 16, 1913, by outlaws in Northern Sonora.

18. Mrs. E. W. Holmes, killed by shell during bombardment of Mexico City, February, 1913.

19. Frank Ward, shot in back by bandits in his home near Yago, Tepic territory, April 9, 1913.

20. John S. H. Howard, United States customs inspector, assassinated near Eagle Pass, Tex., February 10, 1913.

21. Pablo Soto, merchant of Naco, Ariz., killed by a stray bullet March 8, 1913, when rebels attacked Naco-March 24, 1913.

22. L. Bushnell, mounted police, killed in Naco, Ariz., March 24, 1913, by a bullet fired by rebels.

23. Frank Howard, killed by bandits in Coalcoman, State of Michoacan, in March, 1913.

24. Herbert L. Russell, manager of American Vice-Consul McCaughan's ranch near city of Durango, murdered by Rebels September 29, 1912. Consul Theodore C. Hamm cabled report to the Department of State.

25. Robert Williams, policeman of Phoenix, Ariz., killed by Mexican bandits who crossed the line to attend a celebration of Mexican independence day in Phoenix, September 16, 1912.

26. Scott Price, bystander, killed when bandits were firing on Williams.

27. N. Matheson, aged and crippled Mormon, killed while fleeing from Colonia, Morelos, Sonora, September 16, 1912, when bandits were looting town.

28. McKenzie, an American resident, executed near Agua Prieta, September, 1912, because the Rebels suspected he had given information to Federal troops.

29. W. H. Waite, manager of the Esmeraldas plantation at Ochotal, Vera Cruz, killed in April, 1912, when he refused to pay money demanded by bandits. He was beheaded.

30. H. L. Strauss, formerly a newspaper correspondent, killed with thirty-four other non-combatants when

Zapatistas held up train August 11, 1912, near Cuatla, Morelos.

31. Thomas C. Kane, conductor on a Guanajuato railroad. Shot through head when bandits wrecked train at Silao and killed many passengers on April 10, 1912.

32. Pehr Olsson Seffer, formerly a professor in the University of California, killed by rebels April 20, 1911, together with three of his servants near Cuernavaca.

33. R. H. Ferguson, of San Francisco, a member of Troop F, Third U. S. Cavalry, killed by a bullet fired over the border.

34. Two unidentified men killed May 9, 1911, in El Paso by stray bullets fired by Federals and Rebels.

35. Dr. R. C. Clarke, Taylorsville, Ill., shot dead in Mexico City May 27, 1911, by a partisan of General Diaz.

36. John R. Lockhard, Scott City, Mo., mining engineer, killed by bandits in Durango, November, 1911.

37. R. N. Meredith, Troy, Ohio, struck by bullet in Porter Hotel during the bombardment in Mexico City in February.

38. Mrs. Percy Griffith, legs shot off during bombardment in Mexico City.

39. A. E. Thomas, murdered by bandits while protecting his wife and seven children near Nogales, Sonora, March 10, 1912.

40. Robert Huntington, railroad switchman, shot without cause near Agua Prieta, April 13, 1911. (Outlaws.)

41. J. C. Edwards, native of Virginia, shot to death while accidentally within rebel lines near Agua Prieta, April 13, 1911.

42. Stephens Foster, Newark, N. J., killed at Alamo, southern part of California, June, 1911, because he had

professionally treated a wounded insurgent a few days before. (Federalists.)

43. John Hertling, Douglas, Ariz., German-American citizen, hanged near Nogales by rebels under Orozco, July, 1912. (Insurrectionists.)

44. Guido Schubert, German, Douglas, Ariz., friend of Hertling; hanged at same time. (Insurrectionists.)

45. John Camp, killed near U. S. Immigration station in El Paso, May 9, 1911, when the rebels attacked Juarez

46. Antonio Garcia, killed at El Paso, May 9, 1911, by stray bullet fired by rebels.

47. Clarence H. Cooper, throat cut with a knife and robbed at Pearson, August 4, 1913, he being the acting superintendent there. (Insurrectionists.)

48. Graham Taylor, at Aguas Calientas; English; robbed, stripped, August 13, 1913. Taylor died from wounds and left letter giving details of attack, addressed to his wife at Laredo, Texas. An unknown American was killed on same road two days before. (Anti-American bandits.)

49. Thomas or Theron Kelly, American; extra passenger conductor, said to have been the son of Rev. Bernard Kelly of Emporia, Kas., who was at one time chaplain of the U. S. Congress.

50. H. F. Mauders, superintendent of the express service on the Mexico Northwestern Railroad, native of Woodland, Cal. (Insurrectionists.)

51. Lee Williams, assistant to the commissary manager at Madera, 25 years old, son of E. H. Williams of Philadelphia. (Insurrectionists.)

52. John E. Webster, railroad conductor. (Insurrectionists.)

53. E. J. McCutcheon, engineer. (Insurrectionists.)

54. M. J. Gilmartin, superintendent of N. W. R. R. system. (Insurrectionists.)

55. Bernard Schofield, railroad terminal superintendent in Juarez. (Insurrectionists.)

56. J. I. Myers, railroad roadmaster of the Juarez division. (Insurrectionists.)

57. James Burgess. (Insurrectionists.)

58. Mrs. Lee Carruth and five children. (Insurrectionists.)

59. Alfred Olcott, wounded in Sonora with his partner in defending the latter's wife and daughter from outrage.

60. Clemente Vergara. (American.)

61. Gustave Bauch.

62. William Benton, English.

63. Joshua Stevens, American, killed near Tampico, while defending his daughters from attack.

64. One of the most terrible cases was that of the killing of Frank Ward, an American, and the attack on his wife. Senator Fall informed the U. S. Senate Committee there was on file in the American embassy at Mexico City, an affidavit by Mrs. Ward that when her husband was shot and was writhing in the pain of his horrible wounds, she was assailed by Mexican bandits, who then killed her husband.

65. Mrs. Florence Stevens, English, injured during bombardment of Mexico City.

66. Private Parks, U. S. A., executed at Vera Cruz by General Mass (Federal). Taken prisoner in uniform May, 1914.



## CHAPTER XIII.

Madero's supremacy was short. He had ascended by election from the grade of insurgent to the Federal head of Mexico and then he had to deal with what he, in turn, termed "Insurrectos;" with Emilio Zapata at the head of 7000 men operating in the States of Vera Cruz and Mexico, who is perhaps the most unselfish patriot of all the modern Mexican malcontents, in that he has been fighting for a principle alone, and is accredited with giving receipts for what he commandeers. His fight is against the holding by individuals of enormous grants of land given by former governments. In 47 years, (1821 to 1868) the form of government changed ten times, and over fifty persons succeeded each other as Presidents, Dictators and Emperors of Mexico. Both Emperors were shot; Iturbide on his return from London in 1824, and Maximillian, neglected by Napoleon III, who had placed him on the Mexican throne, in 1867.

The cause of Zapata's fight is an endeavor to rectify the wrongs of concession committed by these and more recent administrations.

Francisco Madero was a wealthy, educated, impractical idealist, but quite unsuited to the highly temperamental and warlike nature of the Mexicans, which is inherited from the Conquistadores and Indian progenitors. He promised what may be termed a division of the land among his adherents. \**Dos pertenencias y una vaca*. This promise was unfulfilled after two years, and caused the fire of revolution to again break out in various parts of

---

\*"Three acres and a cow" kind of policy.

the Republic. During this period, United States citizens and foreigners were openly assaulted, insulted on the streets of Mexico City and in other places, killed and their property destroyed.

General Bernado Reyes, the former Governor of Nuevo Leon, took the field against him in 1912, but was quickly captured and imprisoned in Mexico D. F. During January, 1913, intrigue matured into open rebellion, the students of Tlalpam released Reyes from prison, and the national palace in Mexico City was attacked.

Reyes was one of the first killed. General Diaz (nephew of Porfirio) and General Huerta quickly occupied the arsenal and bombarded the city. The streets were littered with dead and wounded. The President's uncle was assassinated and the President made prisoner and subsequently assassinated together with the Vice-President, Pino Suarez, in the National Palace by the tacit consent of General Huerta. After the assassination the dead bodies were placed in a motor car, and a counterfeit attempt to rescue was made by Huertistas by privy arrangement to obscure the truth while the car was en route between the palace and the penitentiary.

Later General Huerta, by finesse, drove the younger Diaz from Mexico and assumed power, which was recognized by all foreign governments except the United States. Since that refusal Mexico has been a slaughter house and hotbed of insurrection. Its fires were kindled in every corner, and when partially extinguished in one place, broke out in another.

In extent the damage to foreign property, commercial and industrial interests was incalculable. Railroads were destroyed and are economically inoperative. Bridges, culverts, and right of way were destroyed for hundreds of miles. Freight traffic was suspended. Troop trains at-

tached to passenger trains were dynamited by other insurrectionists and the loss of life from all causes may be conservatively set down as exceeding 30,000 since the departure of General Diaz. The number of sick and wounded will never be known, as statistics covering the subject are as little regarded as are the unorganized commissary or medical corps.

Certainly the business interests of Paris, Berlin, New York and London wish to know how the matter is to be adjusted. The bonds of the destroyed railroads had been purchased in those cities. The railroad investment is not the only one. Foreign owned mines and industries where millions of foreign capital have been employed, are closed to operation. Smelters at Chihuahua, Torreon, Monterey, Aguas Calientes and San Luis Potosi, involving more hundreds of millions of foreign capital, have suspended operations.

The oil fields of Vera Cruz and Tamaulipas were threatened and harrassed and the export production doubly taxed by the conflicting parties. These interests alone may easily be valued in combined European and United States capital at an aggregate of \$500,000,000. One English company, the Aguila, alone has an investment of 8,000,000 pounds sterling and one American company (Doheny's interests) an investment of \$50,000,000 while there are seventy other operative oil concerns in the Vera Cruz fields, including the Southern Pacific Railroad; John Hays Hammond's interests (Goldfields of South Africa, Limited) and the Waters Pierce Oil Company, whose works were reported destroyed in April, 1914, together with other foreign interests, with a loss of \$5,000,000.

Foreign banks in Mexico have refused deposits and have practically suspended business. German shipping

firms and German ships are suffering, so also are those of English and United States firms. The loss to foreign investors is, computed in the aggregate, in the neighborhood of \$1,500,000 (gold) per day.

Both the British and German Governments have protested vigorously concerning the non-protection of the Vera Cruz oil fields. Their interest is due to oil contracts for their navies.

After the Marconi investigation, which involved certain members of the British Cabinet, public feeling was that members of the Government should abstain from speculation in Government projects. While this subject was "white-hot" in the Parliament, Mr. Winston Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty, informed the House in words to the effect that he did not care if members of the House owned shares in the Eagle (Aguila) Oil Company (Lord Cowdray's), but proposed to publicly inform them that an oil contract for the (British) Navy would be let to that company. About that time Lord Cowdray let contracts for the building of twenty oil tank steamers of an average carrying capacity of 12,000 tons each, to ship oil from Tampico and Tuxpan to Europe. Most of these are in commission today.

As Lord Murray (of Elibank), formerly chief Liberal whip of the present Liberal government, is an associate of Lord Cowdray, and as the latter in addition to his oil interests in Mexico, is interested in the Isthmian Railroad of Tehuantepec, it is not difficult to imagine the source of British anxiety and pressure for protection.

Is the British Government entitled to it from the United States Government in view of Mr. Olney's interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine? Fair minded men will say: Yes! The United States Government is not dealing with private corporations in this instance, such as the Hu-

asteca Oil Company, or Mexican Petroleum Company, whose American interests can apparently be disregarded with impunity. The interests of the Government of Great Britain are directly affected and the pressure behind its complaint to the British Cabinet, not only on Lord Cowdray's account, but because the Mexican situation effects the oil supply for the British Navy. The neutrality of that navy might be appreciated some day by the United States Government in the event of trouble with Asiatics. Germany is also scowling for similar and other reasons.

Will the State Department of the United States ever realize that barbarians must be conquered before they can be pampered? It is the simple history of civilization. The sword in one hand, fire-water in the other and the Holy Script may follow. That has been Britain's method of civilization and colonization, and by that method it has overturned tyranny, rebellion and barbarism on three continents in the last three decades, and now controls the whole of one continent, the major part of another, nearly one-half of North America and a very large part of Asia. These annexations matured during the Victorian period. Queen Victoria hated war, but never avoided it when the occasion demanded it for the uplifting of Britain and extension of civilization. Great Britain had to fight for expansion and civilization, so will America or be humiliated. France and Germany adopted the same policy. The United States is merely temporizing.

In Mexico Spanish subjects were expelled without reason, except that they are Spaniards.

A dispatch to the Press from El Paso, Texas, dated April 8th, 1914, said:

"The Spanish refugees from Torreon began crossing the international bridges (El Paso) shortly after eight o'clock this morning, it was not until this evening that the



last of the unhappy refugees was safe on the American side.

"The delay was caused by the physical examination of the 600 men, women and children composing the cavalcade.

"The examination of the baggage was merely perfunctory, they having no baggage except a few small grips and some bundles of clothing. All had been taken from them before leaving Torreon.

"Refugees said that they had been stripped of most of their belongings of value before being put on board the train at Torreon. They were forced to open the bundles and the Mexican officers took all new articles of clothing and all articles of linen that were clean, saying to the Spaniards: 'When you came to Mexico you had nothing but a dirty shirt, and you can leave Mexico that way.' Among the refugees are some of the richest and most prominent of the Spanish residents of Mexico, chief among them being Rafael Arozarena, cotton king and millionaire of the Laguna district. Like others, he brought but a small hand grip containing some clothing.

"Other prominent Spanish business men of note among the refugees are Jose A. Gonio, J. Serano and A. Arrebijillaya.

"The Roman Catholic priests of Torreon were also exiled with the Spanish subjects. One of the exiles is General Ricon Gallardo, who is a Spanish subject and retains his title of Marquis de Guadalupe."

Inconsistency of action is again clearly demonstrated on the part of the U. S. Emigration officers. These poor harrassed refugees were made to go through the prescribed form of medical examination with a fair chance that many of their number might be refused admission; in which case they would have been between the "Devil





### GENERAL PORFIRIO DIAZ

President of the United States of Mexico for thirty-four years. He raised the Republic to a high plane of prosperity, and on retiring left \$40,000,000 in gold in its treasury



and the deep sea;" whereas the same government but a few weeks before took to its heart and nourished, without question, preliminary examination or quibble, some five thousand filthy followers and deserting soldiers of both sides, Mexicans with all their dogs, cats, chickens and other live stock.

The German Consul at Vera Cruz received a wireless message from the German Cruiser "Dresden" stationed at Tampico, to send to that port as quickly as possible the German steamer Kronprinzessin Cecilie to facilitate the embarkation of fleeing German victims.

Neither Europe nor Asia takes "America" seriously in its foreign policy. They view it tolerantly and with grim humor.

What Europe does take seriously is, that "America" is a good customer and a convenience, and is temporarily placid. The opinion has been advanced, and not unreasonably, that the American expression, "How much is there in it for me?" sums up the growing attitude of the country in politics as well as in religious schisms, and that most other things are subsidiary to that question and its answer.

The administration of the United States has been ineffective in pacifying the Mexican condition. The American people with red blood in their veins feel humiliated at the government's attitude of indecision, inactivity and apparent infirmity.

After all there may be good reason for timidity or what appears to be the chief consideration, apart from the cost in lives and treasure, and that is the country's unpreparedness to undertake armed intervention.

The policy of the U. S. Government in removing the embargo on the exportation of arms from the United States into Mexico has been questioned. Only the Revo-

lutionists could benefit by it. The Federalists could always get arms through the seaports which they controlled. This exported war material soon may be used against the United States in the event of the United States occupying Mexico. In the latter event, probably every warring faction in Mexico would be allied for its defense.

If the government of the United States is forcing on Europe the present misunderstanding of the Monroe Doctrine, it is in honor bound to protect foreign lives and interests in Latin America. If not, the reasonable method would be to invite the powers to join with the United States, and land an allied force in Mexican ports, as in the Chinese occupation; or for the United States to establish an embargo against all war materials, collect and administer the custom receipts of all ports as in the insular fund of Cuba; nominate a Mexican for the Presidency, uphold him with a firm hand and thus bring about an amicable adjustment. The policy of handing to the Revolutionists a knife wherewith to cut the Federal throat, as Mr. Bryan has done, is fatal to foreign interests and is what might be construed as a vacillating effort to let the Mexicans deplete their own fighting forces prior to armed intervention by the unprepared forces of the United States.

The obstruction offered to foreign industry, together with the rape of United States women and the murder of United States citizens and other foreigners by Mexicans in Mexico, has been pointedly disregarded, except that weak official protests were made through the Charge d'Affaires, until the incident of the arrest of the United States sailors occurred by a Mexican Federal official at Tampico. The admiral (Mayo) demanded an apology and a gun salute. The former was tendered and the latter refused by General Huerta, who claimed the apology

he extended was sufficient. A fleet was sent to the Mexican Gulf to enforce the salute. General Huerta cleverly insisted that a simultaneous salute be fired. This qualified apology, it is reported, Mr. Wilson readily consented to at first, and his consent in view of Section 102 U. S. navy regulations which reads as follows:

"No salute shall be fired in honor of any nation or of any *official of any nation* not formally recognized by the Government of the United States."

This elicited the following comments from United States Senator Borah:

"The condition is 'opera bouffe' that would be laughed at all around the world."

Other senators were not so willing to accept the precedents advocated by the administration. Those precedents they said, might be all right in the case of an established government, but ought not to apply in the case of Mexico, where the government never had been "formally" recognized. On general principles there was much criticism of the "way out" of closing the incident.

"The language of the naval regulations appears perfectly plain," said Senator Bristow. "How can you demand a salute from a country where you refuse to recognize its government? When Mr. Wilson demanded of Huerta that he order the flag saluted, he made the demand not of the individual, but of the government.

"You cannot escape from the fact that saluting in reply to the salute given us as an apology, recognizes the Huertan government in Mexico. In ordering this to be done, the President revises the naval regulations, giving to Huerta full standing as the actual head of the government, fully and completely recognized by the United States.

"This whole performance is assinine. If that is all this administration purposed doing why send the whole Atlantic fleet to Mexican waters? There were plenty of vessels there already to reply to Huerta's salute of apology.

"This looks to me much like 'baby play' and not the manner of doing things by a great government, but there are many odd things done by this government for which we cannot account. In my judgment it results merely in a recognition of Huerta and his government. As the situation has turned out it seems to me he should have been recognized long ago as the de facto government in the territory he controls, and Carranza as the head of the de facto government in the territory he controls. Then both could have been held responsible for Americans in their own territory, and gone ahead and fought their troubles to an end, and we would have had the friendship of both sides. As it is now we are acting in a ridiculous manner and it will be so regarded by the American people. We will be the joke of the civilized world."

"I think the less said about this performance the better it will be," said Senator Works of California. "It must strike the world as peculiar to say the least."

The foreign press editorially voices foreign governmental opinion on the subject.

"The Daily Telegraph of London did not believe President Wilson intends to put into effect a resolute military intervention, and sees no hope of putting an end 'to the anarchy, which has resulted from the Wilson policy of moral intervention.'"

"The Daily Graphic considers President Wilson's high moral purposes have landed the United States and the President himself 'in a situation of the greatest difficulty and embarrassment.'"



The Graphic continues:

"Mexico must now be conquered or left alone. The idea *that intervention can be limited to the occupation of Tampico and Vera Cruz, is a fresh delusion which will be speedily shattered.*"

The Standard:

"The big stick which Roosevelt would have used long ago has at last been grasped. The door of peace is still open, but it rests with Huerta to avail himself of the chance."

The Daily Mail:

"If President Huerta has the sense with which he is generally credited in Europe, he will lose no time in making his amende honorable to the United States. That he should deliberately provoke war with so formidable a power on the question of a salute seems unthinkable."

The Mail believes that in the event of war and the ejection of Huerta a temporary protectorate of Mexico is inevitable and adds:

\*"President Wilson is too wise and humane a ruler to consign a vast country to the sheer anarchy which is bound to follow the collapse of such a government as now exists in Mexico."

The Chronicle:

"That any sovereign state might, without loss of dignity have condoned the Tampico affront on receipt of the apology which Huerta has already tendered."

---

\*This argument may also be applied to Villa and Carranza should they succeed.

## CHAPTER XIV.

All this time the situation was unaltered in Mexico in relation to the condition of foreigners, and without relief from the nation whose duty it is to alleviate their sufferings.

The policy of the United States was one of wavering inaction. It did no more to forcibly command peace in Mexico than did any other nation, although its citizens were the greatest sufferers from the depredations of the Mexicans. No reprisal was made on the grounds of the murder and rape of its citizens, or the destruction of their possessions. Instead arms were permitted, by administrative edict, to cross the frontier for the Insurrectionists who are responsible for many murders, including the murder of the British subject Benton. Peace at any price was the attitude of the State Department.

This condition existed until an incident occurred which is best described in the words of the President of the United States, delivered to Congress on April 20th, 1914, as follows:

"Gentlemen of the Congress: It is my duty to call your attention to a situation which has arisen in our dealings with General Victoriano Huerta at Mexico City, which calls for action, and to ask your advice and co-operation in acting upon it.

"On the ninth of April a paymaster of the United States ship *Dolphin* landed at Iturbide bridge landing at Tampico with a whaleboat and boat's crew to take off certain supplies needed by the ship, and while engaged in load-

ing the boat was arrested by an officer and squad of men of General Huerta's.

"Neither the paymaster nor anyone of the boat's crew were armed. Two of the men were in the boat when the arrest took place, and were obliged to leave it and submit to being taken into custody, notwithstanding the fact that the boat carried, both at her bow and at her stern, the flag of the United States.\*

"The officer who made the arrest was proceeding upon one of the streets of the town with his prisoners when met by an officer of higher authority, who ordered him to return to the landing and await orders; and within an hour and a half from the time of the arrest, orders were received from the commander of the Huertista forces at Tampico for the release of the paymaster and his men.

"The release was followed by apologies from the commander and later by an expression of regret by General Huerta himself. General Huerta urged that martial law obtained at the time at Tampico; that orders had been issued that none should be allowed to land at Iturbide bridge; and that our sailors had no right to land there.

"Our naval commander at the port had not been notified of any such prohibition, and even if they had been, the only justifiable course open to the local authorities would have been to request the paymaster and his crew to withdraw, and to lodge a protest with the commanding officer of the fleet.

"Admiral Mayo regarded the arrest as so serious an affront that he was not satisfied with the apologies offered, but demanded that the flag of the United States

---

\*General Huerta denies this. There is a very low railway trestle under which boats have to pass to the landing at Tampico from the River Panuco. The possibility of striking the flag pole in order to clear the trestle should be considered.

be saluted with special ceremony by the military commander of the port.

"The incident cannot be regarded as a trivial one, especially as two of the men arrested were taken from the boat itself—that is to say, from territory of the United States; but had it stood by itself it might have been attributed to the ignorance or arrogance of a single officer. Unfortunately it was not an isolated case. A series of incidents have recently occurred which cannot but create the impression that representatives of General Huerta were willing to go out of their way to show disregard for the dignity and rights of this government, and felt perfectly safe in doing what they pleased, making free to show in many ways their irritation and contempt.

"A few days after the incident at Tampico an orderly from the United States ship Minnesota was arrested in Vera Cruz while ashore in uniform to obtain the ship's mail and was for a time thrown in jail.

"An official dispatch from this government to its embassy in Mexico City was withheld by the authorities of the telegraphic service until peremptorily demanded by our Charge d'Affaires in person.

"So far as I can learn such wrongs and annoyances have been suffered to occur only against representatives of the United States. I have heard of no complaints from any other government of similar treatment.

"Subsequent explanation and formal apologies did not and could not alter the popular impression which it is possible it had been the object of the Huertista authorities to create, that the government of the United States was being singled out and might be singled out with impunity, for slights and affronts in retaliation for its refusal to recognize the pretensions of General Huerta to be re-

garded as Constitutional President of the Republic of Mexico.

"The manifest danger of such a situation was that such offenses might grow from bad to worse until something happened of so gross and intolerable a sort, as to lead directly and inevitably to armed conflict.

"It was necessary that the apologies of General Huerta and his representatives should go much further, that they should be such as to attract the attention of the whole population to their significance, and such as to impress upon General Huerta himself the necessity of seeing to it that no further occasion for explanations and professed regrets should arise.

"I therefore felt it my duty to sustain Admiral Mayo in the whole of his demand, and insist that the flag of the United States should be saluted in such a way as to indicate a new spirit and attitude on the part of the Huertistas.

"Such a salute General Huerta has refused and I have come to ask your approval and support in the course I now propose to pursue.

"This government can, I earnestly hope, in no circumstances be forced into war with the people of Mexico. Mexico is torn by civil strife. If we are to accept the tests of its own constitution it has no government. General Huerta has set his power up in Mexico City, such as it is, without right and by methods for which there can be no justification. Only a part of the country is under his control. If an armed conflict should unhappily come as a result of his attitude of personal resentment toward this government we should be fighting only General Huerta and those who adhere to him and give him their support, and our object would be only to restore to the



people of the distracted republic the right to set up again their own laws and their own government.

"But I earnestly hope war is not now in question. I believe I speak for the American people when I say that we do not desire to control in any degree the affairs of our sister republic. *\*Our feeling for the people of Mexico is one of deep and genuine friendship* and everything that we have done so far or refrained from doing has proceeded from our desire to help them, and not to hinder or embranch them.

"We would not wish even to exercise our offices of friendship without their welcome and consent. The people of Mexico are entitled to settle their own domestic affairs in their own way and we sincerely desire to respect their right. The present situation need have none of the grave implications of interferences, if we deal with it promptly, firmly and wisely.

"No doubt I could do what is necessary in the circumstances to enforce respect for our government, without recourse to Congress and yet not exceed my constitutional powers as President; but I do not wish to act, in a matter possibly of so grave consequence, except in close conference and co-operation with both Senate and House.

"I therefore come to ask your approval that I should use the armed forces of the United States in such ways and to such extent as may be necessary to obtain from General Huerta and his adherents the fullest recognition of the rights and dignity of the United States, even amidst the distressing conditions now unhappily obtaining in Mexico.

"There can, in what we do, be no thought of aggression or of selfish aggrandizement. We seek to maintain

---

\*Mr. Wilson's feelings were apparently not affected by the outrages listed on pages 101 to 107.



the dignity and authority of the United States only because we wish to keep our great influence unimpaired for the uses of liberty, both in the United States and wherever else it may be employed for the benefit of mankind."

The precise programme is not indicated in Mr. Wilson's speech. His actions indicate factional coalition with the bandit Villa against General Huerta. General Huerta's ambassadors were at foreign courts and were recognized, and his minister was at Washington. Mr. O'Shaughnessy was at Mexico City dealing with the Mexican government through General Huerta. Villa and his Revolutionists had no recognized representatives abroad.

General Huerta, the strongest man in Mexico since Porfirio Diaz, did his best to protect foreign interests up to the landing of United States marines at Vera Cruz. Villa and Carranza, on the contrary, were parties to the murder of Benton, and the unsatisfactory attitude of these men during the international inquiry, coupled with Carranza's reply to the United States, plainly stating that he did not recognize the right of its State Department to inquire into the matter of the death of a British subject.

The day following Mr. Wilson's speech to Congress, the United States Admiral (Fletcher) landed marines at Vera Cruz, the time limit for the salute which was not fired having expired. The landing resulted in four United States sailors being killed and twelve wounded, and during the ensuing week the number increased to eighteen killed and seventy-three wounded. Some two hundred Mexicans were killed and wounded during this period by United States marines.

General Huerta then recalled *his minister* from Washington and handed the United States Charge d'Affaires his passports and the following letter :

"Mexico, April 22, 1914.

"Mr. Charge d'Affaires:

"Assuredly your honor knows that the marines of the American ships of war anchored off the port of Vera Cruz, availing themselves of the circumstance that the Mexican authorities had given them access to the harbor and the town because they considered their presence was of a friendly character, disembarked yesterday with their arms and uniforms and possessed themselves by surprise of the principal public buildings without giving time for the women and children in the streets, the sick and other non-combatants to place themselves in safety.

"This act was contrary to international usages. If these usages do not demand, as held by many states, a previous declaration of war, they impose at least the duty of not violating humane consideration or good faith by people whom the country which they are in has received as friends, and who therefore should not take advantage of that circumstance to commit hostile acts.

"These acts of the armed forces of the United States I do not care to qualify in this note, out of deference to the fact that your honor personally has observed toward the Mexican government and people a most strictly correct conduct, as far as that has been possible to you in your character as the representative of a government with which we have been in such serious difficulties as these existing.

"Regarding the initiation of war against Mexico, *this ministry reserves to itself the right of presenting to other powers the events and considerations pertinent to this matter*, in order that they, as members of the concert of nations, may judge of the conduct of the two nations, and adopt an attitude which they may deem proper in view of this deplorable outrage upon our nation's sovereignty.

*"The President of the Republic of Mexico has seen fit to terminate, as I have the honor to communicate to your honor, the diplomatic mission which your honor has until now discharged. You will have the goodness to retire from Mexican territory. To that end I enclose your passport, at the same time informing you that, as is the diplomatic custom on such occasions, a special train will be at your disposal with a guard sufficient to protect your honor, your family and your staff, although the Mexican people are sufficiently civilized to respect, even without this protection, your honor and those accompanying you.*

"I take this opportunity to reiterate to your honor the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) "Jose Lopez Portillo Rojas."

(Huerta's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.)

## CHAPTER XV.

After the murder and violation of one hundred "Americans" by various Mexican Insurrectionists during the past four years, Mr. Wilson is alleged to have said to the newspaper men at Washington :

"I want to say to you, gentlemen, do not get the impression that there is about to be war between the United States and Mexico. That is not the outlook at present, at all. In the first place, in no conceivable circumstances will we fight the people of Mexico."

To discipline General Huerta personally for the murderous acts of the Mexican people, would not in any way correct the decadent state of that country, neither would it drown the fires of insurrection or the political chaos which must and will continue, until a superior force compels all Mexicans to realize their international responsibilities. Neither Carranza nor Villa nor Zapata nor Orozco or the whole bandit quartette acting in concert could ever maintain peace in Mexico for two continuous years. Other aspirants for the Presidency would "bob up" and with as much right as any of these and with as great financial support.

Carranza and Villa have quite as many enemies as has General Huerta. Elevate either of them and give them the power and resources of Huerta, and exactly the same revolutionary condition would exist as exists today, except that the name of Carranza or Villa would be substituted for that of Huerta.

The antecedents of General Villa as hereafter shown, should disqualify him and his irresponsible superiors and

subordinates from any consideration whatsoever by the State Department of the United States on the same grounds that Mr. Wilson has disqualified General Huerta. Mr. Carruthers, the United States emissary, has been constantly in conference with Villa, to the end that his insurgent forces should join the United States forces, or remain neutral in the endeavor of the United States to oust General Huerta from the Presidency. The personal element entering into the question of the endeavor of the State Department of the United States to achieve General Huerta's resignation, even to the extent of a coalition with this murderous bandit brute, seems amazingly inexplicable.

The dignity of the United States Military and Naval Departments has been flouted by the State Department in its request for Villa's support of neutrality, and the subsequent refusal of General Carranza (Villa's insurgent partner) to coalesce, to remain neutral or to cease fighting in northern Mexico, pending the solicited mediation of the A. B. C. arbitrators, throws a spotlight on the combined frailty and timidity of the administration.

Senator Lodge of Massachusetts, read the following to the United States Senate on May 5th, 1914, relative to "General" Villa:

"Born at Las Niegres, Durango, 1868. When 14 he was sentenced to imprisonment for cattle stealing. On his discharge, settled in a mining camp at Guanacevi, where a few months later he underwent imprisonment for homicide. Upon his second release from prison he organized a band of robbers with headquarters in the mountainous region of 'Perico' in Durango.

"In 1907 he was in partnership with one Francisco Reza stealing cattle in Chihuahua and selling them in the

United States, and stealing mules and horses in the United States and selling them in Chihuahua.

"He killed Reza while sitting in the plaza in the City of Chihuahua. In early November, 1910, he attacked the factory of Mr. Sono in Aliende and killed him. By threatening the daughter he obtained \$11,000. He joined the Madero revolution in January, 1911, at Casa Grand, he killed Carlos Alatorre and Louis Ortiz for refusing to pay the ransom money demanded.

"In February of the same year at Batopilas, he tortured Senora Marie de la Luz Gomez.

"When Ciudad Juarez was taken in May, 1911, he killed Ignacio Gomez Oyola, an aged and infirm man of 60, because he denied that he had arms concealed on his premises.

"Early in May, 1913, Villa with seventy-five men attacked a bullion train in Chihuahua, killing the crew and several passengers, including Senor Caravante and Senor Isaac Herrero of Ciudad Guicerro. In the same month, but later, at San Andres he assaulted the house of Sabas Murga. Two nephews of this man were killed, but Murga escaped. Sons-in-law of Murga, who had not taken a part in the fight, were captured, tortured and then killed.

"That month Villa's band took the town of Saint Rosalia, shooting all prisoners and treating the principal officers with terrible cruelty. Business houses were sacked, and many private persons were murdered, the worst case being that of Senor Montilla, cashier of a bank. He was shot, over the head of his wife, who was attempting to defend him. Villa kicked the wife in the face as she lay over the dead body of her husband. He killed Senor Ramos, secretary of the Court of First Instance of Santa Rosalia, arrested twenty of the principal people and terrorized them until he obtained 70,000 pesos.



"In July, 1913, Villa took Casas Grandes and shot more than eighty non-combatants, violating several young girls, among them two young ladies named Castillo.

"In September, 1913, he took the town of San Andres, shooting many peaceable residents and more than 150 prisoners, many of these being women and children.

"In order to conserve his ammunition, Villa ordered these victims to stand four deep, one behind the other, so that the same bullet would do the work for four. Few of these victims were killed outright. The dead and wounded were soaked in petroleum and together thrown into a bonfire.

"Following this he took a small town, Carretas, where he found an old man of 70, Jose Moreno, from whom he demanded \$200. He couldn't pay and Villa killed the man with his own hand.

"September 29, 1913, having overpowered a force of 500 Federals near Torreon, Villa had every prisoner shot. Toward the end of November he took Juarez. Nearly all the Federal officers were shot as well as some sixty odd non-combatants.

"December 8, 1913, Villa captured Chihuahua and seized all the commercial houses of Spaniards and Mexicans. He expelled all the Spaniards. Two Spaniards were beaten to death.

"Villa took prisoner two children of 14 years, called Lorenzo Arellano and Alfonso Moliner. Private houses and motor cars were seized and turned over to public women for their nightly orgies.

"In Chihuahua Villa had shot 150 non-combatants. Ignacio Irigoyan and Jose A. Yanez, not connected in any way with the political situation, were tortured frightfully and finally paid \$20,000 each for their ransom. Villa

then gave them a safe conduct and permitted them to start for the United States. They were pursued by Villa's men, taken from the train and shot.

"The Benton murder at Juarez in which Villa figured, is of recent memory."

The "holdup" of the Terrasas family for \$500,000 under the threat of putting to death one of the sons then a prisoner in Villa's hands, was an act of brigandage unequalled at any time in Italy or Spain.

Mr. H. B. Guthrey, field superintendent of the Pearson Oil Syndicate of Tampico, gave the following interview to the Los Angeles Examiner on May 5th, 1914:

"Tampico today is a city of pestilence. Dead bodies lie in the streets. Three and a half tons of silver (\$420,000 gold value) lie in the banks, unless Mexicans have already secured this.

"As for the oil companies, they are in constant fear that the Rebels will blow up the wells outside the city. It must be remembered that the Royal Dutch Company (English and Dutch) has a well which gives 100,000 barrels of oil a day. Once the cap is dynamited from this well there would simply be a wasted and ever increasing lake of oil. We have a well, the Potrero del Llano, which gives 110,000 barrels a day, and it is quite unprotected.

"I came up on the 'Connecticut' with 470 refugees. We took three prisoners from the jail with us and a baby was born on the way to Galveston. The Government gave us transportation wherever we wanted to go.

"President Wilson may be said to have joined the Rebels. Uncle Sam should have stepped right in after the first insult and beat the tar out of the Mexicans. That is the only and possible course. About \$900,000,000 in American capital is invested in Mexico and we cannot go

back and resume business until the country is protected properly."

Looking at the situation from any angle: The administration's policy of "watching and waiting" is not conducive to patriotic pride, whatever it may be in the conservation of its treasure or lives of its soldiers at the sacrifice of its dignity among nations. Why? Because there was relief, if unpreparedness was the cause of moral instead of armed intervention, in the scheme of allied intervention, or peaceful blockade.

The contradictory situation extant, primarily created by Mr. Taft in readily recognizing one idealist (President Madero) in view of the Chinese atrocities at Torreón, and the non-recognition of General Huerta by another idealist on the grounds that the assassination of President Madero and Pino Suarez was instigated by General Huerta, again establishes a paradoxical condition in the vacillating foreign policy of the United States. Both policies were academic, but they were contradictory.

E. L. Doheny of the Mexican Petroleum Company said on the 29th of April: "Those men, women and children in and near Tampico were left to shift for themselves, among an angry mob of American-haters, who were worked up to a frenzy by a combination of villainous liquors and incendiary speeches furnished and delivered to them by influential members of the community, so far as help from American warships and the American flag were concerned, even admitting that dilatory efforts were made to rescue these poor, abandoned Americans by requesting the soldiers and flags of other nations to furnish that security which they had a right to expect from their own government."

## CHAPTER XVI.

The following is the text of a resolution adopted by the American refugees upon landing at Galveston, Texas, and sent to United States Senators in Washington:

"WE, AMERICAN CITIZENS, RESIDING IN MEXICO, who have just been driven from our homes at Tampico by a savage mob, wish to protest against, and give wide publicity to, the timid and unpatriotic action of the United States government, in withdrawing our warships from the harbor at Tampico at the moment when the lives of 2000 American women, children and unarmed men were utterly at the mercy of the Mexican mob, which, crazed by rum and patriotism, inspired by incendiary and anti-American proclamations and speeches, were preparing to attack, and did attack, American citizens who had placed their helpless women and children in the building of the Southern Hotel, under the protection of those few of us who had not yet been disarmed by the Mexican authorities.

*"We wish the American people to know that we owe our lives solely to the prompt and decisive action of the commander of the German gunboat Dresden, who, at this crucial moment, threatened the Mexican authorities with drastic and punitive measures, and thus rescued us under the German flag, delivering us on board our United States warships, in the open seas. We owe our lives today to the brave Germans, with their one small boat, and not in any way to the action of our own government. We furthermore protest against the present non-protection by our*

own government of the millions of dollars worth of American property in and near Tampico."

In other issues of even more serious import, it is questionable how efficiently affairs of state have been negotiated, especially those embracing the vital and delicate situation involving this country with Japan, and those European powers having treaties with Japan.

The incidents involving the United States are:

First: In the case of Mexico, the non-recognition of General Huerta as President of that Republic by President Wilson and the result; the refusal of the United States Government to specifically intervene for the protection of foreign interests during the four years of civil war in Mexico.

Second: In the case of Japan. The diplomatic cause of irritation, arising from the elimination of Russia and China from the Pacific and Japan's consequent increased development as a Pacific power, as against United States Pacific expansion; the destruction of the Hawaiian monarchy and the annexation and fortification of those islands by the United States.

(2) "While the establishment of United States naval and military bases is in progress in the Pacific, Japan has prepared for it in so effective a manner that notwithstanding what the naval forces of the United States may be in the future, the Hawaiian Islands can be seized from within and converted into a Japanese naval and military base so quickly, that they will be impregnable to the power of this Republic."\*

(3) "The Japanese military unfit have been withdrawn from the population of the islands, and methodically supplanted by the veterans of the Japanese-Chinese

---

\*"Valor of Ignorance," by Homer Lea.



and the Russo-Japanese wars, and the Japanese military occupation of Hawaii is tentatively accomplished."

(4) It may be roughly stated that the population of these islands is in the neighborhood of one hundred and ninety thousand, of which seventy-nine thousand are Japanese, and are guarded by less in numbers, than a full regiment of United States troops.

(5) The influx of Japanese into Hawaii has been entirely political and the outcome will be military.

Third: The further cause for Japanese discontent is the anti-alien ruling and educational question by the State of California.

Fourth: The objection of the United States to the concession of Magdalena Bay (Mexico) to Japanese interests.

Any of these questions may, within a short period of time, result in "serious misunderstandings."

Those responsible for the country's foreign policy have not settled these pending questions and procrastination in favor of internal politics is diplomatically suicidal.

The progress of commerce, industry and land values, has produced a distinct class which no longer finds its intelligence represented in Congress.

This class or better element rarely exercises the franchise, or cares for political gifts from the party in power.

George II. said to Pitt:

"You have taught me to look for the voice of the people in other places than in the House of Commons."

How surely does this apply to the administration of today.

The general opulence of the country has brought about the building of a wall around it composed of self superiority and arrogance. This is regarded in pride by a



majority of the people, and thought to be impenetrable against attack, due to the reliance on the vast natural resources contained therein.

For years it has been the hysterical boast and actual popular belief, that not only could the country defend itself against foreign invasion, but could even conquer a first class foreign power.

This conceit is concrete in the Congress (as developed in Mr. Clark's speech) and out of it. For years the policy has been one of military neglect.

It seems to be forgotten that there exists an East and West monarchical frontier to the North extending over three thousand miles in length and the whole of Latin America extending from the Rio Grande (the Southern frontier) to Patagonia, surging with dislike and contempt for "Americans." The extreme western outlying territory of the United States is at the door of Japan, and is today absolutely at the disposal of that nation, while the time consumed in crossing the Atlantic and Pacific has been reduced to hours and days.

The wall has a breach in it, to say very little of the breach in the inner wall, viz: the practically undefended Pacific Coast.

It seems to be forgotten that the forty-eight sovereign States with their consolidated thriving populaion, more than twice that of Great Britain or three-tenths greater than that of the German Empire, must through the Federal government enter the field of international politics to assert its power, whether it wishes to do so or not, or be subject to humiliation in view of Atlantic and Pacific expansion.

The position taken by administration after administration in relation to the "Monroe Doctrine," not only makes

this imperative, but it demands an immediate military power equal to the pretensions under which the Monroe Doctrine can alone be sustained against the first serious foreign protest or aggression.

Doubtless Mr. Bryce, the former British ambassador to the United States, was cognizant of these and other facts when he said in his speech at Stanford University, "The world is still watching the *experiment* of the republican form of government in the United States."

## CHAPTER XVII.

It has been notorious that necessary funds requisitioned by the Chief of Staff for the legitimate purposes of military maintenance and equipment, have on more than one occasion been materially reduced by Congress.

Per contra, Congress after Congress has entertained and passed appropriations for pension funds for "veterans" of the Spanish War to the extent of *nearly fifty thousand applications* whereas only *thirty-eight thousand* soldiers of all arms (regular and volunteer) landed on Spanish territory during activities. It is safe and fair to say that many are drawing pensions today, who never saw the islands of Cuba, Puerto Rico or the Philippines.

It is much the same with the other pension fund, the legacy of the Civil War. Instead of the amount of the annual distribution consistently decreasing by reason of the deaths of the beneficiaries, it inconsistently increases with the death roll until the annual distribution alone would go far to liquidate the national debt of most countries. This inconsistency, after fifty years, is brought about by the payment in full of the back pension from the date of claim, without regard to disability, and to the widows of ex-soldiers, irrespective of the date of the marriage; for instance: An ex-soldier drawing a pension and 79 years of age may contract marriage with a young woman. On his death the wife is entitled to draw his pension for the term of her life, which taken at this date may be another fifty years, so the pensioner or his heir is eligible to draw what is equivalent to nearly one hundred years of pension for, in instances, *a service of sixty days only*. Certainly a noble gratuity from a grateful

republic so far as money is concerned and paradoxical when compared with the treatment of Schley by the government then in power, which was paradoxical when the attitude of the people towards him was that of gratitude and praise.

This pension is largely absorbed by those who participated in the Civil War of 1861 to 1865. That is to say: the Federal, or ex-soldiers of the United States alone and their heirs, are beneficiaries. The ex-Confederate soldier or Southern participant is ineligible to benefit from this enormous appropriation, although he and the whole South is a compulsory and heavy contributor to the fund.

There are many dissatisfied persons in the Southern States of the United States today, and it does appear inconsistent that the population of the Southern tier of States, fifty years after the war and for another fifty or more years to come shall pay an ever increasing indemnity to their conquerors, when the conquered are re-established in citizenship and live under the same flag.

Indicative of the Southern feeling in this respect, the following is told:

Not long since, two old soldiers, an ex-Federal and an ex-Confederate, were chumming together in the bar of the Kimball House, Atlanta, Georgia.

"Ah, Johnnie!" remarked the northern man, "we certainly licked creation out of you."

"Yes! maybe yer did," replied the southerner a trifle sourly; "but jedging from the size of yer pension fund, I reckon we wounded every \*damnedyankee that escaped."

---

\*A Southern lady (a descendent of John C. Calhoun), of Montgomery, Alabama, told the writer some years ago, that she was twenty before she knew that "*damnedyankee*" was not one word.

The increase of the pension fund is shown as follows:

War with Spain—Beneficiaries, 29,015.

*War of 1812—Widows*, 199.

War with Mexico—Survivors, 1,142; *Widows*, 5,123.

Indian Wars—Survivors, 1,066; *Widows*, 2,330.

Total pensioners on roll June 30, 1913, 820,200.

#### TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS FOR PENSIONS FOR ALL WARS:

War of the Revolution (estimate), \$70,000,000;

War of 1812 (service pension), \$45,923,014.46;

Indian wars (service pension), \$12,241,273.61;

War with Mexico (service pension), \$47,232,572.34;

*Civil War*, \$4,294,596,944.47 (1861 to 1865);

War with Spain and insurrection in the Philippine Islands, \$42,185,230.84;

Regular establishment, \$28,461,369.52;

*Unclassified*, \$16,499,419.44. (to 1913).

Total disbursements for war pensions, \$4,557,539,824.68.

In 1867 there were 36,482 new claims allowed, bringing the total beneficiaries to 155,474, as to 69,565 men and 83,618 widows, making the annual distribution \$20,784,789.69.

In 1877 the beneficiaries were 232,104 as to 128,723 men and 103,381 widows and the annual distribution \$28,182,821.72.

In 1887 the beneficiaries were 406,007, as to 306,298 men and 99,709 widows, and the annual distribution \$73,572,997.08.

In 1897 there were 976,014 beneficiaries as to 746,829 men and 229,185 widows, and the annual distribution \$139,949,717.35.

In 1907 there were 967,371 beneficiaries as to 680,934 men and 286,437 widows, and the annual distribution was \$138,155,412.46.

In 1912 there were 860,294 beneficiaries as to 538,294 men and 322,000 widows, and the annual distribution was \$152,986,433.72.

In 1913 there were 820,200 beneficiaries as to 503,633 men and 316,567 widows with the *annual disbursement* of \$174,171,600.00 paid in war pensions and \$2,543,246.39 for that year's administration of it, or a grand total, including the cost of administration, paid in pensions of \$4,461,097,319.65.

Total number of original applications during fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, 27,881.

Total number of original claims allowed for fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, 19,346.

A financial policy that permits this annual increase is beyond conception, when the majority of the northern participants in the Civil War are dead and the youngest living ex-northern soldier is over 65 and very few under 72. It is even more extraordinary when that policy refuses to provide, in advance, adequate funds to be especially allocated for preparedness in war, or to not grant without quibble the financial requisitions made by trained, efficient and permanent United States officers of the War Department who *know* the necessities. Such a policy is preposterous in the face of conditions pertaining to foreign relations.

That the War Department has been unable to obtain adequate funds from Congress for its efficient maintenance, or funds to procure reserves of ammunition, war material, equipment and general military efficiency of the male population in advance of actual necessity, is to be accounted for by absolute neglect by that body to pay attention to a paramount demand. The comment on this question must not be taken as an objection to pensions for



veterans. It is to show the inconsistency in the growth of the fund as compared with the decrease of beneficiaries. Without the former the income tax would be unnecessary. The great excess in pensions has grown up under the struggle of both parties to control the soldier vote. The pension money was raised by indirect taxation which was not felt by any particular interest. With the income tax swallowed up by the pensions the income taxpayer is sure to develop an active opposition to further pension legislation.

The colossal cost of maintenance of the Federal and States governments collectively, when computed as a whole, is far in excess of that of any form of monarchical government existing, and yet without an army of defense or offense.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

## JAPAN.

In 1906 the Governor of California said in a message to the Legislature:

"Our laws regard intermarriage (with Japanese) as miscegenation."

"They cannot become good American citizens. It is useless to attempt to make them such."

"It is useless to think they can ever mix with our people and become absorbed into our body politic."

In 1905 the California Legislature by unanimous vote of Assembly and Senate adopted and declared "that unrestricted Japanese immigration is a menace to the State."

The Board of Education of San Francisco excluded Japanese from the public schools, and the California Supreme Court declared these acts constitutional.

These acts contravene the stipulations of the treaty and the Federal Government cannot control them. This attitude was first voiced by Governor Gage of California in his biennial message to the State government in 1900, and anti-Japanese legislation also tentatively exists in the state legislatures of Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho and Hawaii.

Two platforms or political programmes in recent national conventions included promised national legislation against Asiatics, which included Japanese. The candidates for the Presidency (Independent and Democrat) were rejected at the (1908) election embodying this plat-

form, and diplomatic controversy with Japan was, for a time, suspended.

At the convention one of the two candidates adopted and incorporated in its platform such sentences as: "and shall protect American civilization from the contamination of Asiatic conditions."

\*"We oppose Asiatic immigration . . . which tends to lower our *high standard of morality*."

Baron Hayashi, Japanese minister of foreign affairs, demanded and further stated that the Imperial Japanese Government would continue to demand of the United States the same rights and immunities for the Japanese, transitory and resident in the United States, as are granted the aliens of other nations (Italy for instance) in accordance with the treaty stipulations.

The legislative acts of the various States have from time to time directly violated or disregarded the rights of foreign nations, and the difficulty of the United States to continue in friendly relations with foreign nations is recognized as a fixed quantity everywhere.

Why do these conditions exist? Because treaties are violated or disregarded by State class (labor especially) legislation, lobbyists, representing great corporations whose powers are as great politically as they are financially, and the conflict of sectional State interests with Federal policy.

These, together with the indifference of the masses, to what happens abroad relating to the tariff forces national legislation to conflict with foreign treaties. The

---

\*3% of the male and 4% of the total female population of the United States are divorced. In 1895 there were 10,500 homicides in the United States; in 1896, 10,662; 1912, 7.5 per 100,000 of population.

utter irresponsibility and weakness of the system can only result sooner or later in war.

The relations with Japan are strained over this question. The United States also arbitrarily has prohibited the colonization by Japanese of a certain area on the west coast of Mexico.

The Mexican government offered no such objection (on the contrary it courted such colonization) any more so than it objected to the colonization of Chihuahua by Mormons, United States citizens, or the development and practical colonization of the oil area (4900 square miles) in Vera Cruz by United States citizens.

In other words the United States has said to Japan: "You can't come here and you can't go there. We will dictate where you may or may not go."

In the meantime the United States' expansion in the Pacific and the fortifications erected at the doors of Japan are offensive, and Japan is resentful.

Is "America" prepared to force its issues? Can "America" enforce the positions it has assumed? Certainly not! In its present state of unpreparedness, the "Americans" and not the Japanese are alone responsible for the coming conflict. Territorial America offers all that is necessary for the maintenance of its millions and many millions more to come. Japan is territorially cramped in comparison and must expand by emigration. The position cannot be remedied by politics or diplomacy when millions of men, devout in their religious tranquillity, religious in their thousands of years of dynastic law and content in their pitiful poverty, yet fierce in their warlike heredity, demand the opportunity to expand and that demand is denied them by a people who cannot enforce the denial.

The recent military victories of these silent Asiatics over China and Russia were great lessons. So was the



The Invaders' Territory, Near Sierra Madre, Southern California  
The Great Strategic Barrier Over Which Relief Must Come





development of the fighting strength of the Bulgarian army in western Europe last year. In two decades of secret preparation the lesson was told to an incredulous world and then forgotten. Since Japan sprung to modern military efficiency in two decades, how much more efficient may it become in two more decades?

Japan will be the real cause for the cessation of the United States evasion of international responsibilities. The causes for this war even now outweigh the causes for peace, hence the reason for the former.

With nations of similar religious, political and sociological conditions, diplomacy might answer, but here the Occident and the Orient are at variance. Traditions of thousands of years are opposed to the political chicanery of a few decades. Hence permanent diplomatic adjustment is impossible.

Great Britain would not ally itself with the United States as against Japan because of its treaty with Japan.

The treaty of 1905 between Great Britain and Japan agrees on:

"The maintenance of the territorial rights of the high contracting parties in the region of Eastern Asia and defence of their special interests in the said regions."

Article II. Should either . . . be invaded in war in defence of . . . special interests, the other party will at once come to the assistance of its ally and both parties will conduct a war in common . . . with any power or powers involved in such war."

Article VII. "The conditions under which armed assistance shall be offered by either power will be arranged by the naval and military authorities of the high contracting parties, who will from time to time consult one another fully and freely on *all questions of mutual interest.*"

The treaty is for ten years and continues indefinitely in effect after that period subject to one year's renunciation by either party. The ten years expire August 12th, 1915.

Germany is too busy in Europe to bother. France is also too busy in Europe and Africa. Russia has no Pacific interests. Great Britain has an offensive and defensive alliance with Japan, and the only reason for peace is commercialism.

The common argument is that Japan has not the money wherewith to make war. It is interesting to know that Japan pays its interest and has good credit, whereas many States of this Union have defaulted interest and repayment of capital to foreign creditors in sums amounting to millions. Not only defaulted but repudiated. In Europe, Japan can borrow colossal sums if forced to do so.

The factors, of the fundamental principle, that are causing Japan to change are invisible at the moment. The change is unconscious and extends over decades, but will stand out sharply defined later in history as having culminated, perhaps, between 1880 and 1940.

Political transformations and war have not always been the precursor of the fall of empires, nor have the sparkling events in history, nor the violence of them, solely impressed the world. It has been the modification of ideas and the change of thought that has chiefly determined the historical events which have crystallized into substantial history, in the looking backward on their full development.

Japan is in the epoch of transition and has been so for forty years and the collective psychological law of mental unity prevails in Japan, antagonistic in its relations and attitude towards the United States.

Individual opinion counts for nothing when the masses

mentally or physically collect. The psychology is such that mental unity is collective in masses and forms in its entirety a new and powerful creation.

The mind of the Japanese is peculiarly sensitive to such phenomena and the day that incubation matures will be the day for preparedness. The nature of the suggestion will make Japan of one mind regardless of the superior intelligence of individuals apart from agglomeration.

Count von Reventlow, a noted writer on naval matters and one of the mouthpieces of the German land barons and who has great influence with the German government, said in April, 1914:

"It is undeniable that President Wilson's Mexican policy has caused much ill will in influential commercial circles in Germany and the United States no longer enjoys the sympathy of Germany as it did in the past."

Count von Reventlow advocates a closer understanding between Germany and Japan. The newspapers are taking up the subject of the relations of the United States and Japan. The *Deutsches Tagezeitung* in an editorial article issues a strong warning against Germany allowing herself to be played against Japan during the present dispute between the latter country and the United States over the alien land question.

*The Vienna Journal*, one of the most influential newspapers at the Austrian capital, editorially reviews the events between Japan and the United States which have led up to the present situation, and says the danger of war between these two countries is greater than ever before. The paper points out that in case Japan decides on war it would be to her advantage to act before the Panama canal is opened. The indications are, it said, that Japan will secretly assist President Huerta of Mexico

with war materials and money. The paper concludes by saying Japan will shut out the United States and send her emigrants to Mexico, which will create a new danger for the United States.\*

The understanding between Japan and the Huerta Government was appreciated by the United States Charge d'Affaires at Mexico when he sent the following cable to the Administration at Washington in March:

"The officers of the Japanese battleship will reach Mexico City next week and will be entertained in Mexico officially by Huerta and his government with extravagant expressions of welcome and friendship. The incident at this time is significant and unfortunate. I think I see in this carefully timed incident the fine hand of Sir Lionel Carden."

This cable aroused the State Department from a condition of lethargy.

---

\*Especially so in the event of military combination.

## CHAPTER XIX.

This Republic is oblivious to the vast military and naval power of Japan, to the hereditary militant character of its people, who for a thousand years have lived in the shadows of their armored war ideals. It is oblivious to the black cloud of the tempest that is rumbling in the West and to preliminary flashes of that tempest, personified in the Japanese secret service emissaries who are occasionally caught in the fortresses on the Pacific Coast with United States military data in their possession; to the shipments to Japan of high class war material such as is not in practical use in any military or naval arsenal of this government; Vanadium steel deck plates, gun shields and projectiles for instance. It is oblivious to the fact that 91,000 Japanese today occupy the Hawaiian Islands; 59,000 Japanese, 98 per cent men of between 18 and 40 years of age are on the west coast of Mexico, a large percentage conscript trained, and 130,000 on the Pacific Coast between the Canadian and Mexican frontiers. The nucleus of an excellent army on mobilization for Pacific Coast occupation.

Los Angeles is defenceless to a landing in its vicinity, the occupation of which means the submission of all smaller towns from the Coast, east to the boundary line of the desert and from San Diego to within gun range of San Francisco.

These smaller towns are defenceless because they are dependent on Los Angeles which has the majority of wealth and population of Southern California.

Strategically no fortification can defend Los Angeles from a land attack, due to the topography of the adjacent country, and must capitulate immediately the hills in its vicinity were occupied by an enemy.

Fort Rosecrans at Point Loma, San Diego, may be disregarded entirely. It would be ignored by an enemy and must capitulate for the mere reason of its isolation. The control or the destruction of the Santa Fe single line of railroad between Los Angeles and San Diego would clinch the isolation, although its destruction would be unnecessary, as it might be used for the transportation of Japanese allies from the South.

Japan's large and fast mercantile fleet will be used for the transportation of troops. It being now possible to land a quarter of a million trained men within a few weeks on the Pacific coast. The first unit of the army, consisting of a hundred thousand men, within four weeks, landing in the State of Washington; the second and third division, landing in rapid succession in Central and Southern California.

To mobilize and transport a United States army with its equipment and impedimenta, to repulse any one of these divisions, would take from four to six months. Japan in time alone, is forty per cent nearer to the Pacific Coast than the flower of the United States army and possesses greater facility in placing its military units, in that water transportation is superior to the single track railroads which must be employed by United States troops from the East.

It seems incredible that without the least obstruction Japan can place an army corps on the Pacific Coast in a shorter time than it would take to march a third of that force from Los Angeles to the environs of San Francisco.



The under-gunned and under-manned fortifications on the Pacific coast (excepting San Francisco) will all be taken by a military assault from the land side and long before any army with adequate equipment from the East can attempt to prevent an occupation, Oregon and Washington, Northern, Central and Southern California will be in possession of the enemy.

It will be at this period that the 58,000 (fifty-eight thousand) Japanese now domiciled in Mexico and the 100,000 (one hundred thousand) Japanese of military age now on the Pacific Coast between the Mexican and Canadian frontiers, will attempt to mobilize.

This, taken in connection with a warlike condition existing in Mexico, will make the position even more difficult. Where will the 80,000 or 100,000 trained and untrained men constituting the army of defense be sent? To which point?

Concentrate them in any one of the Pacific Coast centers of Japanese occupation and the other centers remain undefended.

Split the force and it is out-numbered and out-generalled by topography alone.

Centralia, Washington, will be the objective point. Debarcation will take place on the open beaches near Grey's Harbor, out of gun range of any fortification. Centralia commands Seattle, Portland, Tacoma and Olympia, with all the fortifications at the mouth of the Columbia river and Puget sound.

None of these fortifications will prevent such a landing and today are quite ineffective.

Bremerton and the U. S. Navy Yard is less than two days and the rest less than seven days march from Centralia, the Japanese center, with Seattle their left and Portland their right flanks.

The military value of the Columbia river and the great inland harbors, the latter accessible through the Strait of Juan de Fuca, will be fully realized by the enemy.

The ports protecting these harbors have less combined artillery power than the Japanese battle ship "Kongo" alone, and under the scheme of investment will never fire a gun for the reason that the whole system of defense of the Pacific Coast is obsolete and poor strategically.

Southern California is even in a worse position. Its area covers 75 per cent of desert and mountains. The trend of the mountain chain, the San Rafael, San Gabriel and San Bernardino, is generally Northwesterly and Southeasterly, except the San Jacinto range, which is nearly North and South. These ranges form an Easterly flank some forty miles from the ocean and within its boundaries there exists one of the most fertile territories in the world.

The army of occupation will have possession of this territory.

To the East, and in the rear of these great natural barriers are the Colorado and Mojave deserts. The Colorado desert is, in places, two hundred and sixty-seven feet below sea level. Sand and salt. The Mojave; silica, alkali and volcanic intrusions, the latter showing their black necks and eroded cores over thousands of square miles. A climate both frigid and torrid; waterless at the surface, a portion of the globe that is dead. It is across this desert that relief must come to Southern California from the East to scale the barren walls of these mountains four to eight thousand feet high from the desert. This wall has a front over three hundred miles long. The nearest water is over 130 miles to the East in the rear of the re-



The Arid Desert Through Which Military Relief From the East Must Come to Southern California



lieving force, and its base one thousand miles in its rear across the desert.

There are three passes through these mountains, viz: The Saugus Pass, at the junction of the San Raphael and San Gabriel mountains; the Cajon Pass, dividing the San Gabriel and San Bernardino range and the San Jacinto Pass at the north junction of the Santa Rosa spur and the San Jacinto range.

The first movement of the Japanese will be to control these passes and this would occur before relief could be attempted.

As the vast natural resources of Southern California, profligate in their luxuriance, will be in their rear, it will mean capitulation of that sphere without a fight.

The stragetic position is impossible to overcome. The same applies to Central California with the command of the apex and west side of the Tehachapi Pass, in the Tehachapi Mountains. With the exception of the latter, all the other passes are within four days march of Los Angeles.

Rapid contentration of force to any one point can be made in a few hours from the West or Japanese side. From the East of the mountains, or relief side, the same movement will take weeks.

In the meantime the Hawaiian Islands will be taken from within, occupied and formed into a base of Japanese naval operations. The Philippines will pass simultaneously with the first gun fire. The capitulation of San Francisco will depend on its water supply being defended and the possibility of its defense will be dependent on the first occupation of the Truckee Valley on the Central Pacific Railroad.

If the Pilarcitos, San Andreas and the Crystal Springs reservoirs are attacked by the army of invasion of Cen-

tral California and the sources of supply in the San Mateo mountains are controlled by the Japanese, the occupation of the Pacific Coast in its entirety will be complete long before the arrival of the first United States army of defense.

These conditions are possible now and remain possible even if Japan declared war before its first army of invasion left Japanese waters.\*

The probability of their success is intensified by a sharp descent without warning, in view of the chaotic state of military unpreparedness of the United States and with its next to useless militia forming a part of the first line of military efficiency, officered, as it necessarily must be, by civil and politician-generals, in a modern war, against modern armaments and training and against soldiers whose women look upon their return from battle in the light of a disgrace, and whose religion alone is an incentive to court death on the field.

It is probable that none of this will occur, but the question arises: Why should the existing state of military unpreparedness continue, by leaving open a door on the dangerous side?

---

\*These strategic positions were first brought to the notice of the writer by reading Homer Lea's "Valor of Ignorance," Harper and Brothers, publishers. Prior to reading Mr. Lea's book the writer spent some years on these deserts and in these mountains and subsequently personally visited every pass, mountain range, fortification and city mentioned herein in order to substantiate Mr. Lea's conclusions, which beyond doubt are correct.



## CHAPTER XX.

The skeptic will ask: But what about the Navy? That question is easily answered in this connection. It is divided at this moment between two oceans. The majority of its units are on the Atlantic and are unavailable for the defense of the Pacific Coast. Only one port for crippled ships to repair and no available coal except that from the Atlantic coast or foreign sources. What the conflict between the navies will develop on their confronting each other off the Pacific Coast after the Japanese invasion of it, is dependent on the fortune of war, modern equipment and brilliant handling of the respective forces. Win or lose the result will spell disaster, as the Navy could not expel the invaders once they are in possession of the Pacific Coast. Even at this moment Japanese artillerists are with the Mexican forces on the United States frontier at Mexicali, California, awaiting the Mexican issue.

Something akin to polite ill feeling has developed in Europe and it is demonstrated by certain European powers pointedly ignoring the coming Panama Exposition at San Francisco.

The vital national questions of the moment involve the Japanese situation and its complexities due to the contravention of a treaty; the Mexican situation; the Panama Canal fortification and toll question involving the contravention of a treaty. The financing of Nicaragua by Brown Brothers and the Morgan Syndicate (another story). The internal strike question which again developed in Colorado in which hundreds were shot and many

killed in open conflict with State troops which is tantamount to an armed revolutionary condition.

The country appears impotent to prevent such occurrences and the State to quell them, so the politicians wallow about in a confused sea of internal and international misunderstandings that can only mature in terrific strife for their final adjustments.

Diplomatic "America" has arrived at the edge of the pit.

Whisps that show the angle of the wind, columned eddies precursors of a storm.

## COMPARATIVE NAVIES OF 1914

## EFFECTIVE FIGHTING FLEETS.

UNITED STATES.			*JAPAN.	
Classification	Built	Bld'g	Built	Bld'g
Battleships .....	33	4	17	1
Battle Cruisers.....	.....	.....	.....	4
Armored Cruisers.....	14	.....	13	.....
Protected, first class.....	3	.....	2	.....
"    light .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
"    second class .....	15	.....	13	.....
"    third class .....	.....	.....	4	.....
Unprotected .....	3	.....	4	.....
Scouts .....	3	.....	.....	.....
Torpedo Vessels .....	2	.....	3	.....
Torpedo Boat Destroyers...	46	14	59	.....
Torpedo Boats.....	22	.....	50	.....
Submarines .....	25	22	13	2
Compliment.....	64,780		Compliment	51,054
Reserve Militia	7,526		Reserve.....	114,000
Appropriation for 1914,			Expenditure for 1914	
about \$140,800,000.			\$46,500,000.	
No efficient foreign mer-			Large mercantile ma-	
cantile marine.			rine available for trans-	
			ports and coalers.	

---

\*The British-built battle-cruiser, Kongo, is the only armored vessel completed for this power during the past twelve months. Designed and built by Messrs. Vickers, the Kongo carries eight 14-inch and sixteen 6-inch guns on a displacement of 27,500 tons, and is therefore the largest and most powerful armed battle-cruiser yet completed. Three sister ships, the Haruna, Hiyei, and Kirishima, are under construction in Japan, as well as the battleship Fuso, and three other vessels of the same type whose names have not yet transpired. These ships were originally credited with an armament of ten 15-inch guns, but it is now understood they will carry twelve 14-inch and sixteen 6-inch.

COMPARATIVE STANDING OF THE TWO ARMIES AT THIS  
DATE, 1914.

## UNITED STATES.

*Regular establishment*, 84,869.

Annual cost not including fortifications or military academy, \$94,266,145 or \$1,110.72 per annum per man.

Total organized militia, 122,674. Cost defrayed by individual States; unknown.

System voluntary.

*Unorganized* militia reserve, all able bodied men between 18 and 40. Cost, *no record*.

## JAPAN.

*War strength* first and second line forces only, active army 980,000.

Annual cost \$48,800,000 or \$49.79 per man per annum.

*Reserves*—

Second Reserve, 2,000,000.

Third Reserve, all able to bear arms.

System, 2 to 3 years. Conscription, no substitution.

Had 1,500,000 men engaged in war against Russia—1904.

June, 1914.—“The Japanese cruiser Idzuma, cleared for action, sir, is bearing this way.”

It was the night after the battle of Vera Cruz.

The lookout on the bridge of the flagship California, at anchor in the harbor of Mazatlan, on the west coast of Mexico, made the report to the officer of the deck.

Admiral Howard, commander-in-chief of the Pacific squadron, was notified.

“War with Mexico” was pending.

But why should a cruiser of Japan, a neutral power, come into a Mexican port ready to give battle?

This was the question that Admiral Howard asked at once of Captain Muriama of the Idzuma.

Captain Muriama's answer was evasive.

But his little brown men, stripped to the waist, were on the battle deck.

The situation developed to a crisis three hours later when the lights of the Japanese cruiser, which had been burning brightly, were suddenly put out.

From forecandle to quarterdeck the ship was in complete darkness.

The act in itself, in a neutral harbor, was a hostile one. Admiral Howard got his men to their gun stations.

Throughout the long night, the crew of the California stood by, waiting.

The next day five of Uncle Sam's torpedo flotilla steamed into the harbor of Mazatlan.

They took station, by order of Admiral Howard, in the form of an arc, well in toward the Idzuma.

Warlike preparations on the Japanese cruiser ceased. There was nothing more to be said.

War with Mexico was not declared. The occupation of Vera Cruz did not lead to an invasion of Mexico, as was at first feared.

But 10,000 bluejackets and marines of the Pacific squadron are still wondering what part would have been played by the Mikado's empire if there had been a war.

Admiral Howard reported the Idzuma incident to the navy department just as it occurred. If any diplomatic correspondence on this delicate subject was ever exchanged between the United States and Japan, it has never come to light.

Captain Muriama, schooled in Japanese diplomacy, has been silent on the subject.

He has taken every opportunity to assure "His Excellency, Admiral Howard, of the distinguished consideration of His Majesty the Mikado of Japan."—Suppressed news telegraphed by the *United Press*.

64566-D  
11







University of California, Los Angeles



L 005 489 488 6

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 793 565 3

